

METHODIST REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1889.

ART. I.—EDWARDS ON THE WILL.*

THIS work of another age is still for good reasons entitled to the attention of thoughtful minds. It discusses the greatest of questions—that which lies at the foundation of human responsibility, and at the point of divergence between truth and error, alike in philosophy and theology. And it is the great work of a great leader in the world of thought, a work in the general judgment of scholars rarely if ever equaled as an example of acute, exhaustive reasoning. No candid reader, be his judgment on the question at issue what it may, can fail to acknowledge that the author grapples his theme as a master.

If Edwards is not original in the sense that he traversed new fields of thought, like Shakespeare, he by far transcended his predecessors in his chosen field. But while Shakespeare borrowed freely it does not appear that Edwards consciously borrowed any thing. Doubtless in an unusual degree he surveyed his chosen field for himself as a solitary thinker, and with unsurpassed thoroughness. There is no indication that he was minutely familiar with the history of thought on his subject. He knew his subject as one who had thought more than he had read, and whose reading had, for the greater part, come after his thinking. The whole question, as his mind apprehended it, he had looked through and through. He quotes Locke with respect, but never as an authority. He

* *A Careful and Strict Inquiry into the Prevailing Notions of the Freedom of the Will.* By REV. JONATHAN EDWARDS. 1754. Edwards's Works, vol. ii. New York: Leavitt & Allen.

turned to his opponents only to find what errors were to be refuted. Hobbes he admitted he had not read. Limited reading to a mind like his has its advantages. He never halts nor slacks under the burden of his learning.

Sir William Hamilton was naturally more independent than Edwards, and perhaps his equal in strength; but he knew so thoroughly the opinions of the leading minds of all nations and ages within his chosen field as to require a large expenditure of strength in carrying the weight of his princely lore, and make him bewilderingly conscious of the bearings and difficulties of the questions he discusses. Edwards wrote as one whose mind grasps alone his one subject, and never knew doubt or hesitation on any issue involved. If he had read the leading fatalistic defenders of necessity may it not be doubted whether he could have moved so nearly in their lines of thought with the confidence that never failed him?

Beyond a doubt this great work of Edwards owes much of its intrinsic merit, and much of the power it has had over generations of thinking men, to the fact that it was so purely the product of his own regal mind, and in every line voiced his earnest, unquestioning faith. And it is this which has made subsequent works on the subject so largely reviews of Edwards that, to read them to advantage or with interest, we must first go back and make ourselves familiar with his pages. To this, too, is due the universal respect which its author continues to command, now that faith has outgrown the limits his theory had prescribed and inquires irrepressively for a higher freedom than he deemed possible.

A special reason for turning at this time to the pages of Edwards is found in the want of agreement among Libertarians themselves, and a reactionary tendency of conservative minds toward Edwardsian premises. As a natural consequence, in place of the assurance of the fathers there has come a dangerous agnosticism upon the whole question of freedom, in the shadow of which the philosophy of necessity is creeping stealthily in, and almost without protest is quietly taking possession of the field.*

Arminian Christians are not awake to their responsibility as the natural defenders of freedom. The day has not come to

* We dissent from this concession.—EDITOR.

retire from the field with assured victory. Nor have we occasion to retreat from the conflict as a drawn battle—much less to acknowledge defeat. But we have good reason to examine anew the grounds of our faith in the freedom of moral agency, and it will be a good way to begin with the attentive reading of Edwards's great argument for necessity.* We shall at the least rise from the reading with our eyes open to what necessity is, and a full conviction that between the universal reign of necessity and the absolute freedom of man where he is held accountable there is no middle ground. And we shall be likely also to find the conviction irresistible that it is to day a difficult if not an impossible undertaking to hold the faith and the philosophy of Edwards together. The Christian faith and the necessitarian philosophy each puts upon the other the square negative.

HIS STAND-POINT THEOLOGICAL.

1. The central doctrine of our author's system of faith was the sovereignty of God. He believed that to the will of God as the determining cause is to be traced all that has been, all that is, and all that will be—that not only do all the changes in the material universe come to pass at his command, but that his immutable decree makes certain all the actions and intentions of all men, reaching to their characters for praiseworthiness and blameworthiness, and therefore to their final destiny.

2. As involved in this comprehensive decree he believed that God has unconditionally elected a definite part of the human family to eternal life and foreordained the rest to eternal death.

3. He believed that in carrying out the decree of election God comes to his elect with sovereign grace—with an effectual calling—which makes them willing to comply with the conditions upon which salvation is offered, and without which their compliance is impossible.

4. Yet Edwards as earnestly believed in the moral accountability of man as in the sovereignty of God. He disliked and rejected the statement that God is the author of sin as inappropriate. He believed that God abhors sin as such, and that he has ordained it only where, in his all-embracing view, he sees it to be necessary to the greatest good. He prefers to say God

*The recommendation is good provided the reader will take up immediately afterward Dr. Whedon on *The Will*.—EDITOR.

permits sin rather than that he causes it, though claiming that he has so ordered events as to make it certain that men will sin as they do. These commonplaces of the theology current in Edwards's time need no verifying quotations.

WHAT HE MEANT BY THE WILL.

Our author defines the will thus:

The will is plainly that by which the mind chooses any thing. . . . An act of the will is the same as an act of the choosing or choice. . . . Whatever names we call an act of the will by, choosing, refusing, approving, disapproving, liking, disliking, embracing, rejecting, determining, directing, commanding, forbidding, inclining or being averse, a being pleased or displeased with: all may be reduced to this of choosing. For the soul to act voluntarily is evermore to act electively.—Page 1.

To understand Edwards here we must take into the account the difference between his classification of the phenomena of the mind and that now generally accepted. In his time that which is now known as psychology, and claims to be a science, was but an infant without a name, if, indeed, it may be said to have had an existence. The distinction of the will from the sensibility, and the dependence of mental science upon the facts of consciousness, had not then come into clear recognition. This confusion of two classes of facts was the occasion of like confusion and vagueness in the use of words. It is plain, however, that he uses the term will as including all that we distinguish from it by the word sensibility, but not as covering at the same time what believers in the moral accountability of man now commonly understand to be meant by the will. His psychology found no faculty in the mind by which a man is able to control inclination and choose for himself between alternatives. It completely excluded such a faculty—defined it out, as a thing impossible and absurd, though he sometimes used in his own sense the very language which the believers in such a faculty understand properly to imply it. In his statement quoted above he clusters almost the whole vocabulary of words and phrases for the affections, and affirms them all to be synonyms for “an act of the will” or “choosing.” And from many other statements it is equally plain that in his view an act of the will, a choice, a preference, an inclination, are the same, and are made so by the leveling down of the will

to the plane of inclination rather than by the leveling up of inclination to the will. He quotes Locke with approval thus: "The will signifies nothing but a power or ability to prefer or choose. . . . The word preference seems best to express the act of volition." When Locke, in qualification of this, says, "The will is perfectly distinguished from desire," Edwards replies:

I cannot think they are ever so perfectly distinct that they can ever be properly said to run counter. . . . A man never in any instance wills any thing contrary to his desires, or desires any thing contrary to his will. . . . If we carefully distinguish the proper objects of the several acts of the will, it will not appear . . . that there is any difference between volition and preference, or that a man's choosing, liking best, or being best pleased with a thing are not the same with his willing that thing. . . . A man's doing as he wills and doing as he pleases are the same thing in common speech.—Page 2.

An appearing most agreeable or pleasing to the mind, and the mind's preferring and choosing, seem hardly to be properly and perfectly distinct.—Page 5.

THE NECESSITY WHICH HE AVOWED.

1. Edwards was a theistic Necessitarian, and his philosophy was his apology for his theology. He avowed the doctrine of necessity as a foundation principle, affirming that "the doctrine of necessity, which supposes a necessary connection of all events on some antecedent ground and reason of their existence, is the only medium we have to prove the being of a God."—Page 169.

2. But it was under moral as distinguished from natural necessity that he placed the responsible characters of men—the necessity that belongs to the will—the certainty that one's will, or choice, or preference, will always be determined by the motives that appeal to him. In like manner he distinguished moral ability from natural ability, claiming that while men may have natural ability—hands, feet, voice, mental capacity, opportunity—to do otherwise, if they had the will to do so, yet that all they do and all they will is made certain by providential motives.

There are faculties of mind and capacity of nature, and every thing else sufficient but a disposition: nothing is wanting but a will.—Page 17.

It may be truly said in one word that moral inability consists in the opposition or want of inclination. For when a person is

unable to will or choose such a thing through a defect of motives, or the prevalence of contrary motives, it is the same thing as his being unable through the want of an inclination, or the prevalence of a contrary inclination.—Page 15.

To him it was obvious that there is and can be no such thing as freedom of will, or choice, or volition, but that motives always govern the will and are the cause of volitions.

The will is always determined by the strongest motives. . . . That motive which, as it stands in the view of the mind is the strongest, that determines the will.—Page 4.

Any other view, it was certain to him, involves the absurdity of an effect without a cause.

3. He admitted that "moral necessity may be as absolute as natural necessity; that is, the effect may be as perfectly connected with its moral cause as a natural necessary effect is with its natural cause;" and he affirmed that between the two kinds of necessity the "difference is not so much in the nature of the connection as in the two terms connected" (page 14), and that "the will in every instance acts by moral necessity, and is morally unable to act otherwise."—Page 102.

4. He believed the moral necessity under which the decree of God had placed all men to be itself a moral necessity; that from the perfection of his wisdom and goodness the will of the supreme Being must ever be his unavoidable preference for the one best way to the attainment of the greatest good. He had appointed evil, moral and physical, never for its own sake, but only as he saw it to be a necessity to this worthy end.

5. He maintained that moral necessity is not inconsistent with praiseworthiness and blameworthiness, but is rather the foundation of both; that the farther one is removed by the strength of the virtuous inclination divinely implanted in him from the possibility of sin the higher his moral excellence and his moral standing with God; and, on the other hand, that the farther one's inclination to sin, however he may have come by it, removes him from the possibility of holy obedience the deeper his moral culpability and the greater his condemnation. He maintained, that if an act were not prompted by a prevailing inclination it must be an act of moral indifference, or without moral quality.

THE LIBERTY WHICH HE CLAIMED.

It would be injustice to Edwards not to make prominent his advocacy of what he understood to be liberty. He thoroughly believed the moral necessity which he so frankly avowed to be the true defense of "the utmost liberty that can be desired, or that can possibly exist or be conceived of." He defined liberty to be "the power, or opportunity, or advantage that any one has to do as he pleases."—(Page 17.) But he believed it to be morally impossible that a man should in any instance be pleased to act otherwise than he does act, and therefore that freedom must always be limited to one open way.

If the will, all things considered, inclines or chooses to go that way, then it cannot choose, all things considered, to go the other way.—Page 101.

A man is truly morally unable to choose contrary to a present inclination which in the least prevails.—Page 102.

Throughout the work, let it be noted, the author uniformly placed freedom in *the doing as one pleases*, and *denied it in willing or choosing*, which with him were always the same.

Quoting from an opponent the statement, "He may if he PLEASE CHOOSE otherwise," Edwards answers: "Which is the same thing as if he had said, 'He may if he choose choose otherwise.'" It was to prove the impossibility of freedom of will or choice that he employed his famous argument known as the *dictum necessitatis*, by which he was confident he had driven his opponents either to the absurdity of an infinite series of volitions each having an antecedent free volition, or to the self-destructive conclusion of a first volition that is not free, and upon which all the other volitions of the series, few or many, depend.

HOW FAR HE WAS RIGHT.

1. Our author was right in treating the question of freedom as one of theology as well as of philosophy. He would have done better if he had kept his arguments from these two sources more distinct, that each might be seen to stand on its own merits, and had subjected both arguments to the clearer light of his own personal faith in God. It is more and more seen to be a mistake to treat the question of freedom as purely a philosophical or metaphysical one. The day may come when

a sound philosophy of freedom will win general acceptance, but it will be under the lead of religious faith. The age of the higher philosophy has not come. "The science of science" is a goal unreached rather than a known and trusted guide.

Is it not reason that faith in God and the eternal verities should evermore lead and transcend our philosophy? The statement of our author, that "the doctrine of necessity is the only medium we have to prove the being of a God," shows how in his mind our question is connected with that of theism. He believed that any break in the chain of necessity carrying every event back to God as the Great First Cause would destroy the argument for the being of God, and hence that the doctrine of a freedom not under the law of necessity would break this chain into fragments, and plunge us into the vortex of atheism.

How different all this looks now! Not Necessity but Freedom is recognized as the strong link that connects our question inseparably with Theism. Not all who are Christian in their faith are ready to give a decisive answer to the question of liberty or necessity. But it is a significant fact that the champions of liberty are all Christian, and that avowed Necessitarians are generally either Atheists or Agnostics. They find but an endless chain of necessity with no Great First Cause. Atheism and freedom are seen to be contradictory, and freedom and accountability to a God above us inseparable. Whatever freedom we have is God-given, and our conceptions of God must control our views of freedom. On the other hand, our notions of freedom unavoidably affect our conceptions of God. True Theism carries with it essential truth as to the freedom of moral agency, and in turn a consciousness of such freedom carries thought with the might of irresistible conviction upward to a supreme and righteous moral Governor.

2. Our author was right in claiming for Necessity some plausible advantages. His doctrine of universal Necessity gave him the advantage which cannot be claimed for the freedom of moral agency that it is within the easy comprehension of ordinary intelligence. Theistic necessity affirms that God has made man with no other freedom than to do as he finds himself pleased to do, and that man can never be pleased to do otherwise; and further, that in doing this God has himself acted under the same law. He, too, is free only to do as he

pleases, and his pleasure can never be other than the one best way. This is straightforward and simple; the common mind takes in at a glance both the divine and human side of the scheme. There is no difficulty in seeing how a Being of infinite intelligence and power can control all men and have a plan of his own embracing all their actions, if in their entire activity, mental and physical, he has placed them under law of necessity.

Not so simple is the philosophy of Liberty. How a wheel is turned by a crank is easily comprehended by a child to whom the movements of the hands of a watch are a mystery. So a mind that has the satisfaction of looking through the scheme of Necessity and seeing its self-consistency may not hope with like ease to master all the difficulties involved in the freedom of moral agency. How a dependent being can be made free to choose for himself, and how such freedom can be adjusted to harmony with the sway of a divine Providence, are not postulates to all minds. Is it reasonable to expect that any mind under our present limitations shall be able to compass these problems on all their sides and in all their bearings, and clear them of all their difficulties?

It is reasonable that the human side of the problem should be clear; but that is simply our own consciousness of moral obligation, which of all facts is the surest. It is what all men know of themselves and are confident of with regard to men. But consciousness of obligation includes consciousness of freedom, or power of choice, as every whole includes its parts. Besides, there is no axiom plainer than that accountability involves such freedom, and without it would be impossible. But when we turn to the other side of this problem, and ask how the Spirit calls us to freedom? in what measure we hold this high trust? when it begins? how frequent its exercise? and how it stands related to the plans of Providence? we have neither the self-mastery, nor the philosophic insight, nor the knowledge of God requisite to exhaustive answers.

But this advantage of Necessity carries with it a decisive objection. It is too easy to be true. It is comprehensible because it is on too low a plane. It logically rules out all moral distinctions. It would not be fair to charge upon Edwards the belief that God is the author of sin, nor that holiness and sin are but empty names, nor that God is the only real

actor in the universe, and that man is but a machine in his hands: but it is fair to charge this upon his logic. His philosophy is purely fatalistic, and he escapes the conclusion of fatalism—that there is no such thing as holiness and sin—only by rejecting the legitimate consequences of his arguments.

Our author plausibly defended his belief in necessitated holiness by instancing "God's moral excellency as necessary, virtuous, and praiseworthy;" also, "The acts of the will of the human soul of Jesus Christ as necessarily holy, yet virtuous, praiseworthy, rewardable." Doubtless the moral attributes of God are all natural attributes and not acquired virtues. How this is possible is indeed inexplicable to us. But this is one of the mysteries of Theism, and such a mystery as we may expect to find, without mental shock or disturbance.

But the mystery of praiseworthiness in God is not at all a difficulty involved in the freedom of our moral agency. God is not a moral agent, a responsible being like ourselves. By no means does it follow from the uncreated holiness of God that he can create rewardable holiness in man. Reverently may it be said he could not create another independent being like himself. The argument for the freedom of man as inseparable from his accountability holds in its full force.

3. Our author was right in claiming a sovereign Providence over all men and all events. With but little qualification may it be said that this is the faith of all devout theists, as it unquestionably is a doctrine of the inspired word. Not that it accords with all the speculations of either Libertarians or Necessitarians. But to know the faith of a people we must not go to their theories, but mark the language in which they worship. It is here that all voices with substantial harmony acknowledge the universal sway of a paternal Providence, and at the same time on our part an accountable freedom. The true doctrine as to our freedom cannot be in conflict with this concord of faith in a heavenly Father's all-embracing care.

But a heavenly Father's providence over us, we must not forget, means not hinderance but help, not repression or coercion but freedom. Providence is for us, not against us. How God governs men within the province of natural law, as shown in a previous article, is not a mystery, nor does it directly concern the present subject. Freedom to choose and act for our-

selves, and take hold upon God, is claimed only, and is possible only, where God gives us such freedom.

That God has perfect knowledge of the future actions and volitions of men, ethical as well as non-ethical, with Arminians generally as well as with Calvinists admits not of question.* In support of the foreknowledge of God Edwards presents the argument, scriptural and logical, in its full force. Not only is the evidence abundant and decisive that the praiseworthy and blameworthy volitions and deeds of men are known to the omniscient One before they become actual, but also that he has a plan in the lives of men which implies minute direction and comprehensive arrangement extending to all the events with which we have to do.

But the conclusion of our author, that in his responsible character every man is what God had predestinated him to be, is not only self-destructive, but in spite of all protests involves the monstrous absurdity that God is the author of sin, and acquits those who are branded as sinners as the innocent victims of stupendous wrong. A guiding Providence over the plans of men, however, by no means involves these absurdities. Every master-mind among men, whether at the head of the family, the school, the club, the Church, the party, or the State, has wide sway over the outward actions of those under his lead, and of course over the antecedent thoughts, inclinations, and volitions from which they spring, and that without necessarily touching the moral principle upon which they act. The thousand men employed by a manufacturer carry into his service their own moral characters—the same characters they would carry into the service of another a hundred miles away under conditions radically different. Yet no particular act or volition of any one of these laborers is precisely the same as would have given expression to his character in the employ of the other men. In like manner every human being has more or less to do in determining the actions of fellow-beings. It cannot then be incredible that the infinite God, who knows all men perfectly and has all power, should be able to hold all men in his guiding care without interfering with their perfect freedom at the sources of all re-

* Dr. L. D. McCabe rejects the doctrine of the divine foreknowledge of future contingencies. The German theologians are not a unit touching this doctrine.—
EDITOR.

sponsible character—the heart. How could this thought receive more apt expression than as we find it in the inspired word: “There are many devices in a man’s heart: nevertheless the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand. A man’s heart deviseth his way, but the Lord directeth his steps?”

The difficulty of foreknowledge is simplified to this:* how it is possible for God to read the characters of men before they take form, and that is but a mystery, not an absurdity nor an ethical monstrosity; and, as was said of the praiseworthiness of God, it is a mystery not of moral agency, but only a small part of the mystery of God, with which we have nothing to do, and about which it is folly to puzzle ourselves. Of course, a man’s responsible character is his own work, or he could not be responsible for it. Surely it is not a burden upon faith that the all-seeing Eye is able to look into the hearts of men and shape his plans for them wisely in view of what he sees there.

4. Our author was right in his charge against the notion of liberty which he chiefly combated—that of a self-determining power in the will independent of motives—that it is not tenable. It is not possible to walk upon vacuity or breathe without air. No more is possible voluntary action without motive. The impossibility of an act of the will without motive and its necessity in the presence of motive are truths too obvious to need or admit of proof. But this does not justify the conclusion of our author that in all cases “motive is the cause of the act of the will” (page 53)—that “the will in every instance acts by moral necessity, and is morally unable to act otherwise.”—Page 102. It does not touch the question of freedom to choose between motives opposite in kind. Is it not in obvious harmony with our absolute freedom to choose for ourselves where the voice of God in our consciences calls on us to resist natural appetite or desire, and he holds us accountable for our choice?

Where the question before us is simply between rival natural inclinations, doubtless either inclination may be strengthened or weakened by an increase or decrease of motives, and here, as our author claims, “it is possible for motives to be set before the mind so powerful . . . as to be invincible, and such as the mind cannot but yield to.”—Page 116. Not so when the

* The difficulty is larger than here stated. It includes the influences, divine as well as human, that produce character, as well as the result produced.—EDITOR.

issue is between God on the one side and inclination on the other side. Will any one be found to talk of the balancing of motives or the indifference of the soul on a question like this? Can reason think to weigh conscience in the scales with appetite or any natural desire of the mind? * Does not the very notion of duty place it above all comparison with other motives that oppose it?

With a moral issue before us emphasized by the voice of God it is absurd to talk of the overbalancing of liberty by multiplying motives on either side. Double a man's intelligence of the right, and, other things being equal, the area of his liberty and responsibility will be doubled, but not his prospect for securing the favor of Heaven. It is impossible that it should be, under an administration of justice.

Against other current and historic notions of liberty—the original Edwardsian that made it to consist in one's power to do as he pleases or wills; the modified Edwardsian, that defines it to be the power to will as one pleases, and that which claims in all the actions of men freedom to alternatives, yet infers from the preponderance of motive what even the responsible choice will probably be—lie two common and decisive objections. First, they all overlook or treat vaguely the radical distinction between ethical and non-ethical action. To disregard a distinction so fundamental is to ignore the weightiest consideration involved. Second, the qualified freedom which they offer cannot in justice be made the basis of moral accountability. Edwardsian liberty equally under both its forms, as Edwards frankly avowed, means absolute moral necessity. The merit of this doctrine is, that it carries with it its own antidote. Moral no less than natural necessity is inconsistent with responsibility. The other notion of liberty is more plausible from a surface view, but lacks coherency. If it is legitimate to infer probability in the responsible actions of men from the preponderance of motives, then on the same ground may we, when the motives are made strong enough, infer certainty.

5. Our author was right, *with one notable exception*, in restricting freedom to the power or opportunity one has *to do as he pleases without power to do otherwise*.

His psychology will do for all the lower animals, so far as

* How, then, account for depravity?—EDITOR.

we know them. Obviously they all have within their limits the power to do as they please—the bird to fly, the fish to swim, the hare to run, the worm to crawl—all to act out the inclinations of nature, and this is all the freedom they have, and all they have any occasion for. It would do for mankind with the power of conscience eliminated. Without consciousness of moral obligation what would the human race be but the most intelligent of the animal tribes?

Freedom to do as one pleases is the freedom of infancy every-where, and of all those who from ill birth and ill training are not yet developed up to the estate of moral accountability. How far this may embrace the heathen world within and without geographical Christendom it is not for us to judge. But this we know, as we know enough to be accountable, that the righteous Father holds only those responsible whom he himself calls to this high trust.

Freedom to do as we please is the freedom of all men, the good alike with the bad, upon the myriad of questions where they properly act upon the plane of natural inclination, or, which is the same thing, within the domain and under the lead of natural law. Whether our choice be a sour apple or a sweet apple, a lunch of toast or leeks, a saddle or a carriage, a horse or a mule, a large hat or a small one, an atmosphere pure or impure, a temperature seventy above zero or forty below, if no other consideration enters, are to us no questions. In any such case the intervention of conscience alone can supply an alternative to inclination. So long as the case is purely one of natural appetite or desire the mind has no occasion to project itself in active volition antecedent to the executive act which causes the tongue, the hand, the foot, to do the bidding of its choice. Here our will or choice can be no other than our unavoidable preference. We have no immediate agency in determining it any more than whether the blood in our veins be Caucasian or African.

According to these conclusions, the realm of action within which the freedom of man is limited by necessity, just as Edwards claimed, to what he cannot help being his choice, is very broad, including numerically the great majority of human actions, and affording, therefore, large room for the sway of a divine Providence in the affairs of men. They leave all the activities

of the world not prompted by loyalty to a consciousness of obligation to a God above us as absolutely in his control, through the agency of natural law, as are the motions of the planets.

Nor does the higher freedom of loyalty of soul to the morally right take the actions and volitions of men out of the embrace of a guiding Providence. Rather, it is in the exercise of this nobler freedom that we rise to the higher plane of filial obedience, and come of our own choice into the very lines of Providence. The freedom of moral agency consists in no degree in power to determine when and where and how and in what connections we obey or disobey the voice of God. Alternative freedom is summed up in the power to choose between God and forbidden pleasure.*

The one exception to our author's doctrine of freedom is, that the very dispensation of the Spirit that makes us accountable at the same time and within the same limit endows us with power to make the will of God our pleasure. No man's natural inclination is God-ward. But when, seeing the will of God, we make the great surrender, just then do we begin to incline toward God. God's pleasure begins to be our pleasure, our preference, our will, our choice, when we adopt it. But this is not of nature. The natural man cannot organize and vitalize himself into a spiritual man.

6. Our author, then, was so far right in his doctrine of the dependence of man upon an effectual calling of the Spirit of God as that no man can come to God except as God comes to him with spiritual help. By his call in their consciences do his children first rise above the inferior freedom to do their own pleasure to the higher freedom to resist forbidden indulgence and take hold upon the divine; and by the inspiration of his Spirit do they make all their subsequent advances. How plain does it appear from this that the great Father has also in his perfect control the obedient activity of his loyal children! But even on this higher plane of moral action the Father works *in* his children to will and to do, not alone through their consciences, but more and more through their affections, making his pleasure theirs, till the life struggle ends in victory and they are completely transformed into his likeness, and to do the will of God becomes henceforth the soul's undisputed, supreme delight.

* This is too great a limitation of freedom.—EDDIE.

THE DICTUM NECESSITATIS.

Since our author gave such prominence to his noted dictum, and was so sure it had forever driven freedom of choice from the field, it may be well to notice its claims. It is found in Part II, Section I, and is repeated in other connections. It may be summarized thus :

1. The only way the will can determine any thing is by choosing it, for "in every act of the will the mind chooses." 2. If, therefore, the will is free to determine its own choice it must do so by choosing its choice. 3. It follows either that every choice arises from an antecedent free choice, and so on in an infinite series of free choices, or that there must be a first choice which is not free upon which all the antecedent choices depend, and, consequently, that the whole series of choices is necessitated.

The main difficulty, in answering this attempt to involve the doctrine of freedom to alternatives in the absurdity of an infinite series of dependent free volitions, arises not from its subtlety or its strength, but from the vagueness and fluctuating senses of its language. According to the terms freely used by our author in his statement, the will "determines," "governs," "commands," "chooses," "acts." But we have seen that his idea of the will is that it is simply the mind's preference, or prevailing and unavoidable inclination. Instead of being an actor the will is an irresistible prompter to action. Instead of choosing freely, it is itself the mind's unavoidable choice. This is all he can consistently mean.

Such phrases, freely used by him, as "an act of the will," "an act of volition," "an act of choice," do not fitly represent his thought. They might be used to mean the act of the mind in the execution of its will or choice—the doing of the mind's pleasure; but that is just where our author places freedom, while it is precisely in what he represents by these phrases that the dictum undertakes to prove the impossibility of freedom. But for thus borrowing the language of freedom and using it in the service of necessity the author is not wholly responsible. The inconsistencies of his language arise not from mental dishonesty or lack of courage, but from the difficulty of his task as the defender of necessity. It is impossible to defend neces-

sity without such inconsistencies. The common language of mankind implies more liberty than his doctrine admits. The obtrusion of such phraseology into an argument for necessity may be taken as the unconscious protest of liberty against unnatural bonds.

THE SUM.

Upon the main question between freedom and necessity there is but one point of difference worth contesting. But the point of freedom is the point of power in man, and the turning-point between opposite courses of action for life—the true and the false—and is, therefore, the pivotal point of the eternal issues of probation. But even this—freedom to surrender to God in resistance to inclination—is not claimed as an unaided natural power, but rather as a power dependent upon an inspiration from God. The will is not a mysterious endowment that constitutes a man an independent actor or a self-acting machine. Upon questions non-ethical to us what can the will be but the mind's power to execute its unavoidable preference? Here what we call our choice is not of our own making: the will can serve us only in the taking of what we find to be our choice. But upon questions ethical to us I understand the will to be first elective, then executive; in other words, we first make our choice and then proceed to take it. How can we be under obligation to choose the will of God without full power to do so? How can we be conscious of such obligation without consciousness of such power? Does not the one hold the other? But an act of choice is not setting out on an independent line of action, whether morally right or wrong. Choose which we may, the right or the wrong, we are free to carry out our choice only in the path Providence makes for us. Our actions, the volitions from which they spring, and the plans that comprehend them, are all under the direction of a power above us. To choose is evermore to elect between masters. At this point, and this only, is our freedom absolute.

2—FIFTH SERIES, VOL. V.

S. White.

ART. II.—MOHAMMED AND HIS KORAN.

IN the latter part of the sixth century there was born at Mecca, in the Arabian peninsula, a child destined to exert a most powerful influence upon the destiny of the human race, and who became the author of a system of religion and civil polity contained in the Koran which has disputed with Christianity itself the dominion of the world. This child, on account of a favorable omen connected with its birth, received the name MOHAMMED.*

It is the purpose of this article to present the most salient points in the history of this remarkable man, and the most important features of his religion as contained in the Koran, the fundamental document of his system. And first of all, to get a clear view of Mohammed and his work, it is necessary for us to know the state of the country in which he lived, and the influences that surrounded him and which were potent in forming his opinions and in molding his character. Mecca, Mohammed's native town, is situated in a well-watered valley in the mountainous region of Arabia, about fifty miles from the Red Sea, and about midway on the great route of the caravans which passed between the southern part of Arabia Felix and Petra. Qossay, a member of the Koreish tribe, and an ancestor of Mohammed in the fifth degree, seized upon the valley, enlarged the town, and settled there the members of his tribe about A. D. 400. Owing to its favorable position it attained a considerable degree of prosperity, and in the time of Mohammed its population was about twelve thousand.† Its special attraction was the venerable temple, the *Kaabah*, whose origin was lost in a remote antiquity.‡ Long before the time of Mohammed it had been the usage of the tribes from all parts of Arabia to make a yearly pilgrimage to this temple, to march around it seven times, and to kiss reverently the famous Black Stone in its eastern wall.§ What the psalmist said of Jerusalem might

* Mohammed, *greatly praised*, passive participle, second conjugation of the Arabic verb *hamida*.

† This is Dr. Sprenger's estimate.

‡ There was a tradition among the Arabs that the temple owed its origin to Abraham.

§ The *Kaabah* is an irregular cube, the sides of which vary from forty to fifty feet in length.

be applied to Mecca: "Whither the tribes go up." At the time of Mohammed the *Kaabah* contained three hundred and sixty idols; the great idol, Hobal, occupied the center of the edifice. The fact that Qossay and his descendants extended to the yearly pilgrims the rites of hospitality gave them great power among the other Arab tribes.

Arabia in the time of Mohammed, strictly speaking, had no government. The tribes were independent. "The opinion of the aggregate tribes, who chanced for the time to act together, was the sovereign law." Honor and revenge were the chief forces in the Arab character. The first incited him to deeds of hospitality, and the second protected him from ill treatment and made him a terror to his foes. From what has been said, it is easy to infer that the mass of the Arabs were pagans. Their wandering, predatory habits, their love of revenge, their proud spirit and impatience of restraint, were adverse to their reception of the doctrines of the meek and lowly Jesus. Among the divinities of the Arabian Pantheon may be named Allâh Ta'âlah, the God most high; three female divinities, El Huzza, Allât, and Manât, called the daughters of God, mentioned in chap. liii of the Koran; Hobel, the chief of the minor deities, Suwah, Nasr, and Isaph. Sabæanism (the worship of the stars) had not entirely disappeared at the advent of Mohammed. Nevertheless, Christianity had established itself in certain parts of Arabia. Two kingdoms of Arabs, emigrants from Arabia, existed in the time of Mohammed. One of these, the dynasty of Palmyra, the Ghassanides, embraced Christianity in the time of Constantine, and belonged to the Greek empire. The other kingdom, that of Hira, on a western branch of the Euphrates, about forty miles below the site of ancient Babylon, became Christian in the latter part of the sixth century, and in the first part of the seventh became a satrapy of Persia.

In southern Arabia, in the province of Najran, Christianity gained a footing as early as the fourth century, it would seem, and a Christian government was established there before the middle of the sixth century under an Abyssinian viceroy; but before the end of the century the Abyssinians were driven out and the province became a dependency of Persia, a pagan power. Gibbon truly remarks:

If a Christian power had been maintained in Arabia, Mahomet must have been crushed in his cradle, and Abyssinia would have prevented a revolution which has changed the civil and religious state of the world.*

There were also some Christians in Mecca and other parts of the country. Tribes of Jews were found in Medina and its vicinity, and in other regions of Arabia.

Writing was already in use at Mecca before the time of Mohammed; but it does not appear to have been employed to any great extent in the production of works in prose. Arabic literature seems to have been almost wholly poetry. At the annual fair at Ocâtz, a delightful spot about three days' journey east of Mecca, the bards of Arabia vied with each other in poetical contests, and the successful poems, called Moallakât, were hung up† on the *Kaabah*, written on Egyptian silk in letters of gold. These poems are anterior to the time of Mohammed. "They are," says Muir, "a wondrous specimen of artless eloquence. The beauty of the language and wild richness of the imagery are acknowledged by the European reader."

We must next consider *the sources for the history and doctrines of Mohammed*. Here must be put as the primary source the Koran itself, the genuineness of which is not disputed. This book, containing the genuine teachings of Mohammed, is written in the noblest Arabic dialect, the Koreish, spoken and written at Mecca. Professor Palmer says:

Regarding it, however, from a perfectly impartial and unbiased stand-point, we find that it expresses the thoughts and ideas of a Bedawi Arab in Bedawi language and metaphor. The language is noble and forcible, but it is not elegant in the sense of literary refinement. To Mohammed's hearers it must have been startling, from the manner in which it brought great truths home to them in the language of their every-day life. . . . The prophet spoke with rude, fierce eloquence in ordinary language. The only rhetorical ornament he allowed himself was that of making his periods more or less rhythmical, and most of his clauses rhyme—a thing that was and still is natural to an Arab orator, and the necessary outcome of the structure of the Arabic tongue.‡

* *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. iv, p. 243.

† Their being hung up on the *Kaabah* is questioned by Nöldeke.

‡ *Introduction to the Koran*, pp. lxxvi, lxxvii.

Mohammed prided himself greatly upon the *unique* character of the Koran, and deemed this an unanswerable proof of the divine origin of the book.

This Koran could not be devised by any besides God. . . . Do they say, he [Mohammed] hath devised it? say, then, bring a surah* like it. . . . Say, if mankind and jinns united together to bring the like of this Koran, they could not bring the like.†

That the like has not been produced is still regarded by his followers as an irrefutable proof of its divinity. Upon this Nöldeke well remarks:

Mohammed did not demand that they should produce something poetical or rhetorical equal to the Koran, but something *essentially* equal to it. But this was, in the nature of the case, impossible for his adversaries. Could they in the same manner defend the old polytheism, of which they really were so little convinced, as he did the unity of God and the dogmas connected with it? . . . Or should they likewise become enthusiastic for the unity of God, and attack only the prophetic character of Mohammed? In that case they could only copy the Koran, which they wished to equal; and a picture can never be equal to the original.‡

The Koran is about half the size of the Pentateuch, and contains one hundred and fourteen *surahs* or chapters, varying in length from two hundred and eighty-six verses to three. The most of them are stated to have been revealed at Mecca and Medina, extending over a period of about twenty-three years. They are generally arranged according to length, and not in the order in which they were delivered, the longest standing in the first part of the book and the shortest in the last. Mohammed professed to have received them from the angel Gabriel. They were immediately inscribed upon palm leaves, leather, broad stones, shoulder-blades, or some other convenient material, by his secretaries; for the Koran nowhere represents Mohammed as writing any thing, and it is still an open question whether he could write. No collection of the *surahs* was made during the life-time of the prophet. But about a year after his death—when many of the best reciters of the Koran had been slain in battle at Yemâma in the overthrow of Moseleima—Omar expressed the fear that the text of the Koran might

* Surah x, 39.

† Surah xvii, 90.

‡ *Geschichte des Korans*, p. 44. Göttingen, 1860.

become uncertain when those who best remembered it should have passed away. He accordingly advised the Caliph Abu Bekr to give immediate orders for its collection. Abu Bekr, following this advice, appointed Zaid, who during the last part of Mohammed's life had been his secretary, to make the collection. Zaid, after some resistance, gathered up from various quarters the scattered surahs, and formed them into one whole, and delivered it to Abu Bekr, at whose death it came into the hands of Omar, his successor in the caliphate, and during his ten years' reign this was the standard text. From some cause—either from the variations in the original transcripts, from errors committed by Zaid in his edition, or from variations in copies taken from it, various readings made their appearance which scandalized the Moslem world. The Caliph Othman was invoked to put an end to this confusion, which he did in a summary way. He appointed a commission, consisting of Zaid and several of the Koreish, to form a new edition of the Koran. They collected all the copies, and made as the foundation of the text the original collection of Abu Bekr, which since the death of Omar had been in the custody of his daughter Haphsa, the prophet's widow. After the text had been completed Othman caused all the rest of the copies to be destroyed except that of Abu Bekr, which was returned to Haphsa. He then sent several copies of this new edition to the different provinces to serve as a standard text. From the edition of this caliph our present text of the Koran is derived. That this text exhibits the surahs, essentially, at least, as they existed at the death of Mohammed, there can be no doubt. They were published when many who heard them recited were still alive, and the reverence of the Moslems for the sacred character of their prophet would prevent them from falsifying his teachings. The great Orientalist, Ewald, remarks, in speaking of the Koran: "Its language is abrupt, difficult, very often rough, full of very rare forms, and upon the whole it requires a good and cautious interpreter." *

But while the Koran is for us the chief source for the doctrines of Mohammed, it furnishes us with comparatively few facts in the life of the prophet. It is a singular fact, however it may be explained, that Zaid, his adopted son, is the only one

* *Prolegomena, Arabic Gram.*, p. 16.

of his companions that he mentions by name, so barren of personal matters is the book. The earliest biography of Mohammed that has reached us and the later Moslems is that of Ibn Ishâq, who died in the year 151 of the *Hijrah*, that is, about *one hundred and forty years* after the death of the prophet. Even this work is not extant in its original form, but only in the revision of Ibn Hisham, who died in the year 213 or 218 of the *Hijrah*.* He made but few changes in the original work, and where he made additions he always put his own name to them. Nöldeke regards this work as by far the richest and the best of the extant sources for the history of Mohammed; but at the same time he does not acquit Ibn Hisham, like all the older biographers of the prophet, of having committed a pious fraud in the omission or change of single facts to the credit of Mohammed, as he himself confesses. The next biographer of the prophet is Al Wākidi, who died in the year 207 of the *Hijrah*. He spent a part of his life at the court of the Abbassides at Bagdad. The fourth valuable source for Mohammed's life is the work of Tabari, who died at Bagdad in the year 310 of the *Hijrah*.

It is thus seen that we have no life of Mohammed and no collection of traditions respecting him written within the *first hundred years* after his death. And Dr. Sprenger remarks that "the nearest view of the prophet which we can obtain is at a distance of one hundred years."† But this is not the only difficulty in the way of obtaining a clear view of the life of Mohammed; party prejudice has distorted, invented, or omitted tradition to suit its own purposes. About a hundred years after the death of Mohammed, the friends of the Abbassides united with the party of Ali, the son-in-law of Mohammed, to raise to the caliphate some descendant of Abbas, the uncle of the prophet. They denounced the dynasty of the Om-miades—who were but distantly related to the prophet—as usurpers. "Perverted tradition," says Sir W. Muir, "was in fact the chief instrument employed to accomplish their ends."

It was during the reign of the Abbassides that the biographers of Mohammed and the collectors of tradition respecting

* *Hijrah*, *Flight* of Mohammed from Mecca, June 20, A. D. 622, the Mohammedan epoch.

† Sprenger's *Life of Mohammed*, p. 68.

him lived. That they were prejudiced in favor of this dynasty, or, at least, feared in some cases to tell the truth, there can be no doubt.

Bokhâri,* who traveled from land to land to gather from the learned the traditions they had received, came to the conclusion, after many years' sifting, that out of six hundred thousand traditions, ascertained by him to be then current, only four thousand were authentic! And of this selected number the European critic is compelled, without hesitation, to reject at least one half. † On the tradition respecting Mohammed, Muir thus remarks:

Its authority must rest on some companion of the prophet, and on the character of each individual in the long chain of witnesses through whom it was handed down. If these were unimpeachable the tradition *must be received*. . . . They dared not inquire into internal evidence. . . . The spirit of Islam would not brook free inquiry and real criticism. Upon the apostate Moslem the sentence of death—an award resting on the prophet's authority—was vigorously executed by the civil power. To the combination, or rather the *unity*, of the spiritual and political elements in the unvarying type of Mohammedan government must be attributed that utter absence of candid and free investigation into the origin and truth of Islam which so painfully characterizes the Moslem mind even to the present day. The faculty of criticism has been annihilated by the sword. ‡ . . . The grand defect in the traditional evidence regarding Mohammed consists in its being wholly *ex parte*. § . . . The system of *pious frauds* is not abhorrent from the axioms of Islam. Deception, in the current theology of Mohammedans, is under certain circumstances allowable. The prophet himself, by precept as well as by example, encouraged the notion that to tell an untruth is on some occasions allowable. ||

To these sources for the history of Mohammed must be added the transcript of treaties made between Mohammed and the neighboring tribes, and which were still in force in the last part of the second century of the *Hijrah*. A further source is found in the verses and poetical fragments referring to Mohammed, composed about his time.

Having thus considered the sources for Mohammed's life and doctrines, we shall next give a sketch of that *life* and then of those *doctrines*. Mohammed was the son of Abdallah and

* *Al Hijrah*, 257.

† Dr. Weil in Sir W. Muir's *Life of Mohammed*, p. 574.

‡ Muir's *Life of Mohammed*, p. 575.

§ *Ibid.*, 580.

|| *Ibid.*, 594, 595.

A'minah. Two months before the birth of his child the father died. The infant, after having been suckled a few months by a slave woman, Thowaybah, was intrusted to a woman, Halimah, of the Banu Sa'd, who kept flocks in the neighborhood of Táyif, about fifty miles east of Mecca. It was customary with the rich inhabitants of Mecca to send away their children from the pestilential climate of the city into the desert to be brought up among the hardships of the genuine Arab life. When four years old Mohammed had a nervous fit. After keeping him five years his nurse restored him to his mother at Mecca. When six years old his mother died, while she was returning with him from a visit to Medina. Her slave woman brought the young prophet to Mecca, where his grandfather, Abdal-Mottalib, fondly cherished him. The grandfather, dying at the age of eighty-two years, intrusted the child, then eight years old, to Abu Tálib, the young prophet's uncle. At the age of twelve years he accompanied this uncle on a mercantile journey to Syria which extended at least as far as Bostra. It lasted four months, and gave the youthful Mohammed a fine opportunity of observing the customs of the civilized and Christian people of that region, whose institutions were in such striking contrast with those of the idolatrous Meccans.

As to acquired learning [says Sale], it is confessed he had none at all, having had no other education than what was customary with his tribe, who neglected, and perhaps despised, what we call literature.

When near twenty years of age he attended upon his uncles in a battle fought between the Koreish and the Hawazin, but he himself took no conspicuous part. "Physical courage, indeed, and martial daring," says Muir, "are virtues which did not distinguish the prophet at any period of his life." The annual fair held at Ocâtz, where the various tribes of Arabia met in friendly rivalry in the contests of eloquence and poetry, must have been deeply interesting to Mohammed. Here tradition relates that when a young man he was deeply affected by a sermon which he heard preached by Qoss, the Christian bishop of Najran, in southern Arabia. Certain it is that late in life he referred with satisfaction to the memory of Qoss, the son of Sáida, and spoke of him as having there preached the true catholic faith.

At the annual fair at Ocátz he became familiar with the bitter controversies between the Jews and Christians and their common contempt for the idolaters, and it is not unlikely that he conceived there the idea of uniting all these people in one religion that should contain elements common to all of them. At one period of his youth he was employed in tending sheep and goats upon the hills and in the valleys adjacent to Mecca. When twenty-five years of age, at the instance of Abu Tálíb he was hired by a rich widow of Mecca, Khadijah, to take charge of four camels laden with merchandise bound for Bostra. In due time he reached the celebrated Syrian city, disposed advantageously of his merchandise, and returned in safety to Mecca. Khadijah was so charmed with Mohammed that she offered him her hand in marriage, and was accepted. He was twenty-five, and she was about forty. This marriage gave him high position and wealth, both of great value to a public leader.

Respecting the personal appearance of Mohammed Dr. Sprenger remarks :

He was of middling size, had broad shoulders, a wide chest, and large bones ; and he was fleshy, but not stout. . . . His oval face was rather fair for an Arab. The forehead was broad, . . . his nose was large. The mouth was wide. . . . He stooped and was slightly hump-backed. The mildness of his countenance gained him the confidence of every one ; but he could not look straight into a man's face.*

Until his fortieth year he was a zealous worshiper of the gods of Arabia.

The predominance of his imaginative powers, and his peculiar position, gave him a turn for religious meditation. He annually spent the month of Ramadhán in a cave of Mount Hara, where the Korashites used to devote themselves to ascetic exercises. In this retreat he passed a certain number of nights in prayers, fasted, fed the poor, and gave himself up to meditation, and on his return to Makkah he walked seven times round the Ka'bah before he went to his own house.†

About this time doubts of the truth of the pagan religion of Arabia arose in the mind of Mohammed. In the midst of his mental struggles, while strolling over Mount Hira, a lonely

* Sprenger's *Life of Mohammed*, pp. 84, 85.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 94, 95.

place not far from Mecca, an angel appeared to him, and thus addressed him :

“ Read in the name of thy Lord
Who created man from congealed blood !
Read for thy Lord is most generous !
Who taught by the pen !
Taught man what he did not know ! ”

These are the first five verses of Surah xvi. Did Mohammed believe that he was directed to read the Jewish and Christian Scriptures ? That would seem to be the most natural meaning. But if the Arabic verb *qaraa* be rendered *recite*, what was he to recite ? The Scriptures, we would say. This vision was the transition from his old pagan state and the beginning of his prophetic life. But he was not happy, and several times contemplated suicide by throwing himself down from precipices. His friends were alarmed. He himself doubted the soundness of his mind. “ I hear a sound,” he said to his wife, “ and see a light. I am afraid there are jinn in me.” At another time he said : “ I am a *kāhin* ” (soothsayer). “ God will never allow that such should befall thee,” said Khadijah, “ for thou keepest thy engagements and assistest thy relations.” His preaching at this time was rather of a private nature, and the people of Mecca treated his mission with contempt and looked upon him as one possessed of an evil spirit. For about two years he had received no revelation. This period is called *fatrah*, *intermission*.

Existing prejudices [says Dr. Sprenger] left no alternative to Mohammed but to proclaim himself a prophet, who was inspired by God and his angels, or to be considered a *kāhin*, possessed by Satan and his agents the jinn. Khadijah and her friends advised him to adopt the former course ; and after some hesitation, he followed their advice, as it would appear, with his own conviction.*

One day, while wandering about among the hills near Mecca, with the intention of committing suicide, he beheld Gabriel between heaven and earth, and was assured by him that he was a prophet of God.

Frightened by this apparition [says Sprenger] he returned home, and feeling unwell he called for covering. He had a fit, and they poured cold water upon him ; and when he was re-

* Sprenger's *Life of Mohammed*, p. 108.

covered from it he received the "revelation" in the following words :

O thou who art covered ! Rise up and warn !
 And thy Lord magnify !
 And thy garments purify !
 And abomination shun !

These verses are the first part of Surah lxxiv. Mohammed refers to this vision in Surah lxxxi, 20: "Your comrade is not mad; he saw him [Gabriel] on the plain horizon, nor does he grudge to communicate the unseen." With this revelation his public mission properly begins. And we may ask, What credentials did he exhibit in proof of his divine mission? Nothing but the messages themselves; which in many instances falsify history, pander to human passions, and contradict the teachings of Christ. The inhabitants of Mecca repeatedly demanded of Mohammed some visible proof of his heavenly mission. His only reply is that the Koran itself is a miracle—that former prophets who wrought miracles were not believed. The whole tone of his surahs is a confession of weakness, which is shown in his angry replies, in the threatening language in which he indulges, in the perpetual reference to the fires of hell in which the unbeliever is to burn. "Naught hindered us," he represents God as saying, "from sending thee with signs, save that those of yore said they were lies."* "They say," affirms Mohammed, "unless there be 'sent down upon him signs from his Lord'—say, verily, signs are with God, and verily, I am an obvious warner."† "They say, unless he bring us a sign from his Lord."‡

Let us now take a rapid view of Mohammed's progress in his prophetic mission. His wife Khadijah was his first convert. Also Zaid, once Mohammed's slave, but freed, and then his adopted son, became a convert. Next Ali, Mohammed's cousin, a bright youth, adopted the new system. But the most important accession was Abu Bekr, a wealthy merchant, who had long been the friend of Mohammed. Through his influence, Sád, Zobeir, still in their minority and relatives of the prophet, Talha, Othmán, and Abd al Rahmán, joined the prophet. The slaves of Mecca were especially susceptible to the new religion. Among the early converts was Bilál, tall, dark, with negro features, a slave ransomed by Abu Bekr from

* Chap. xvii, 61.

† Chap. xxix, 49.

‡ Chap. xx, 133.

persecution. He was the first *muezzin*, or crier to prayer. Muir judges that Mohammed had nearly forty converts in the first three or four years after his assumption of the prophetic office. His converts were made in the midst of difficulties. He and his followers were violently persecuted by the people of Mecca, who were strongly attached to the idolatry of the Kaabah. It became necessary for Mohammed to leave Mecca. He attempted the conversion of the people of Táif, but was treated with violence and driven out of the town. He returned to Mecca under the protection of the chief Mutáim.

His enemies having formed a plot against him, he with Abu Bekr took refuge in a cave a few miles from Mecca, and about three days later he set out for Medina, where his zealous missionaries had already gained many converts. His departure took place June 20, A. D. 622, the 4th of the third month of the first *Hijrah*, the Mohammedan epoch. At this time Medina was agitated and divided between two opposing tribes. Internal war, strife, and assassination rendered every thing in Medina insecure. The city was ready to accept any one who could restore tranquillity. On a Friday he entered Medina, and his camel being left to take her own course, she sat down in the house of Abu Ayúb. He soon formed a treaty with the Jews in which it was stipulated that "the Jews will profess their religion, and Moslems theirs." But the rejection of Mohammed's mission by the Jews excited his bitter hate.

Mohammed was accustomed to conduct religious services at Medina on Fridays; but while busily engaged in promoting the spiritual interests of his people, true to his Arab-instincts, he did not neglect plunder. The caravans passing between Medina and the Red Sea on the way between Syria and Mecca were irresistible temptations to the prophet. Having failed in the capture of the caravans in several instances, his attempt to intercept the caravan of Abu Sofíán on its way to Mecca brought on the famous battle of Bedr, a place situated about a hundred miles to the south-west of Medina. The Meccans, with nine hundred and fifty men, came to the aid of the caravan. Mohammed with a force less than one third of that number engaged and defeated them. This splendid victory established his authority; for he alleged that it was the interposition of heaven in his behalf. After this he carried matters

with a high hand. Assassinations at the suggestion or command of the prophet soon followed. It became extremely dangerous to oppose him.

The progress of Islam [says Muir] begins to stand in unenviable contrast with that of early Christianity. Converts were gained to the faith of Jesus by witnessing the constancy with which its confessors *suffered* death; they were gained to Islam by the spectacle of the readiness with which its adherents *inflicted* death. In the one case, conversion often imperiled the believer's life; in the other, it was for the most part the only means of saving it.*

It was not to be supposed that the Meccans would make no effort to retrieve the disaster of Bedr; that would have been the most contemptible cowardice. Accordingly, about a year after that defeat, the Meccans collected an army of three thousand warriors from various sources, marched to the vicinity of Medina, and encamped west of the Ohod mountain, which lies north-east of the city. Mohammed marched out of the city and engaged them. His army was defeated, and he himself was wounded in the mouth and reported to be dead. The Meccans thereupon left for home. The defeat was most damaging to the prophet. His success at Bedr was claimed as a proof of his divine mission; then, by parity of reasoning, was not his defeat at Ohod subversive of his prophetic claims?

In A. D. 625, expeditions were sent out by Mohammed in various directions, increasing his power. The Jewish tribe Bani Nadhir were driven into exile. About this time Mohammed married two more women,† who were widows. Being smitten with the wife of his adopted son, Zaid, her husband proposed to divorce her. Mohammed at first declined, but afterward accepted the offer; she was divorced, and they were married. As this marriage created scandal, the prophet got a pretended revelation from the Almighty justifying it.

In A. D. 627, the Meccans, with various tribes of Bedawin, amounting to ten thousand men, advanced to the siege of Medina. Mohammed, by the advice of a Persian, extended around the unprotected parts of the city a ditch, which was completed just in time to save the place. The Meccans and their allies, failing to capture the city, left one stormy night.

* Sprenger's *Life of Mohammed*, p. 258.

† A few years before his death his wives numbered *ten*, besides two concubines.

This siege is known in Mohammedan history as the Battle of the Ditch. Soon after this the Jewish tribe Beni Quráidhah, near Medina, were taken by a siege, and the men, eight hundred in number, were beheaded. After this he had no further opposition in the region of Medina, and his power was continually growing. In the sixth year of the Hijrah he concluded a treaty of peace with the Meccans for ten years. In A. D. 628 he sent dispatches to the Emperor Heraclius, to Chosroes, king of Persia, and to the governor of Egypt. The latter alone made a courteous reply, while not admitting his claims. About this time he was poisoned by a Jewish maid who had lost relatives in the subjugation of the Jews of Kheibar. The effect of this poisoning he felt all his life. In A. D. 629 he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. In the following year, with an army of eight or ten thousand men, he made a conquest of Mecca. About A. D. 631 his authority was extended into southern Arabia. In the March of the following year he made his last pilgrimage to Mecca and addressed a vast crowd of pilgrims near the city. In the last of May of the same year he was taken sick of a fever, and after an illness of about ten days he died in Medina on the 8th of June, A. D. 632, in the sixty-third year of his age. At his death his power extended over all, or nearly all, of the Arabian peninsula, although Dr. Sprenger thinks that not more than one thousand men really believed in him at that time.

We must next consider the position of Mohammed toward *the Old and the New Testament*, and then discuss *the doctrines of the Koran*. On the first, we may observe that he always assumes the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures. He represents his revelations as confirming those already given :

We gave Moses the Book * [that is, the Pentateuch]. But before it [the Koran] was the Book of Moses, a model and a mercy; and this is a book confirming it in Arabic language.† Verily, we have revealed the law in which is guidance and light; the prophets who were resigned did judge thereby those who were Jews. . . . And we follow up the footsteps of these [prophets] with Jesus the son of Mary, confirming that which was before him and the law, and we brought him the Gospel, wherein is guidance and light. . . . When God said, O Jesus, son of Mary, remember my favors toward thee and toward thy mother, when I aided thee

* Chap. xli, 45.

† Chap. xlví, 11.

with the Holy Ghost till thou didst speak to men in the cradle and when grown up. And when I taught thee the Book and wisdom and the law; when thou didst create of clay, as it were, the likeness of a bird, by my power, and didst blow thereon, it became a bird; and thou didst heal the blind from birth, and the leprous by my permission; and when thou didst bring forth the dead by my permission; and when I did ward off the children of Israel from thee when thou didst come to them with manifest signs, and those who disbelieved amongst them said, "This is naught but manifest magic."*

Mohammed represents the Jews as saying:

Verily, we have killed the Messiah, Jesus, the son of Mary, and the apostle of God. . . . But they did not kill him, and they did not crucify him, but a similitude was made for them. . . . They did not kill him, for sure! Nay, God raised him up unto himself; for God is mighty and wise! And there shall not be one of the people of the Book [Jews] but shall believe in him before his death; and on the day of judgment he shall be a witness against them.†

Mohammed also refers to the miraculous conception of Christ, which he manifestly accepted. He also makes reference to the incidents connected with the birth of John the Baptist.‡ But while Mohammed believed in the divine mission of Christ he rejected his divinity:

The Jews, says he, say that Ezra is the son of God; and the Christians say that the Messiah is the Son of God; God fight them! how they lie!§ Jesus, the son of Mary, is but the apostle of God and his word . . . and say not "Three."|| He is but a servant whom we have been gracious to.¶

In reference to the Deity, Mohammed says:

Say, He is God alone! God the Eternal! He begets not and is not begotten! Nor is there like unto him any one.**

Mohammed had but a slight acquaintance with the New Testament. We have no proof that there existed any translation of it in Arabic in his time. He makes but few references to the Gospel history, and in them he blends the stories of the Apocryphal gospels with the authentic statements of the evangelists. He never mentions any of the apostles of Christ by name. On the Christian doctrine of redemption he has nothing to say. He declares, as we have already seen, that

* Chap. v.

† Chap. iv. 155, *et seq.*

‡ Chap. xix. 1-15.

§ Chap. ix. 30

|| Chap. iv. 169.

¶ Chap. xliii. 59.

** Chap. cxii.

Christ was not really crucified, but taken to heaven. He indeed pretends that his own appearance was predicted by Christ:

And when Jesus, the son of Mary, said, . . . Verily I am the apostle of God to you, verifying the law that was before me, and giving you glad tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, whose name shall be *Ahmed*.*

It is evident that Mohammed here refers to the *παράκλητος* (Paraclete, Advocate, Comforter), which Christ promised to send. John xiv, 16, 26; xv, 26; xvi, 7. *Ahmed* (*most praise-worthy*) is about the same as Mohammed (*greatly praised*). Some Moslem who had been a Christian must have suggested to him this ingenious device by which *παράκλητος* is converted into *περικλυτός*, *renowned*. *Περικλυτός* does not occur in the Greek Testament, nor can I find that the meaning *renowned* was ever given to *παράκλητος* in any ancient version.

Mohammed was a *Unitarian* in the strict sense of the word. He, no doubt, was disgusted with the idolatry of the Arabs, especially with the worship of the divinities, *Lât*, *Manât*, and *Ozza*, said to be daughters of God. Flying from this idolatry and the superstitious observances of the Christians of his time, and having no clear conception of the doctrine of the New Testament, he took refuge in absolute Monotheism. He seems to have thought that the Virgin Mary was one of the persons of the divine Trinity in the Christian system. Mohammed in his teaching and practice was far more a Jew than a Christian. We may, indeed, characterize his religion as *bastard Judaism*. On this point Dr. Sprenger remarks:

He devoted more than two thirds of the Koran to biblical legends, most of which he has so well adapted to his own case that if we substitute the name of Mohammed for Moses and Abraham we have his own views, fate, and tendency. †

The fundamental doctrine of the Koran is: "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is the apostle of God." In proof of the divine existence, he repeatedly refers to the operations of nature, and often in eloquent language. But for the *second* part of his fundamental doctrine, his apostleship, he has no proof to offer but the Koran itself, the sublimity of which, as Gibbon confesses, is surpassed by the Book of Job. In the system of Mohammed the omnipotence of God and his exalta-

* Chap. lxi, 6.

† Sprenger's *Life of Mohammed*, p. 108.

tion above all created things, and the unmeasured distance between them and God, are strongly set forth :

Almighty power was apprehended in this religion as unlimited arbitrary will; or if some occasional presentiment of the love and mercy of God gleamed out in the religious consciousness, yet it did not harmonize with the prevailing tone of the religion, but necessarily borrowed from the latter a certain tincture of *particularism*. Hence the predominant fatalism, and the total denial of moral liberty.*

According to the Koran, God readily forgives sin. The resurrection of the dead, a day of judgment and subsequent rewards and punishments, are articles of faith in the teachings of Mohammed. The intermediate state between death and the resurrection is assumed in the Koran.† The rewards and punishments of the future life are of a sensuous nature. Paradise is described as having in it

rivers of water without corruption, and rivers of milk, the taste whereof changes not, and rivers of wine delicious to those who drink; and rivers of honey clarified; and there shall they have all kinds of fruit and forgiveness from their Lord.‡

Further, the Moslems in Paradise are described as having

a stated provision of fruits, and they shall be honored in the gardens of pleasure, upon couches facing each other. They shall be served all round with a cup from a spring, white and delicious to those who drink, wherein is no insidious spirit, nor shall they be drunk therewith; and with them damsels restraining their looks, large-eyed.§

The chief religious duties prescribed in the Koran are : 1) The performance of the stated prayers. 2) The bestowing of alms only upon "the poor and needy and those who work for them, and those whose hearts are reconciled (to Islam), and those in captivity, and those in debt, and those who are on God's path, and for the wayfarer." 3) The fast of the month Ramadân, during which the Moslem is neither to eat nor drink any thing from the morning twilight until sunset.

The great crimes of murder and adultery are, of course, forbidden in the Koran. The former is punishable with death, but a ransom may be accepted in its place by the relatives of

* Neander's *Hist. of the Chris. Church*, vol. iii, p. 85.

† Chap. xxiii, 100.

‡ Chap. xlvii, 15, *et seq.*

§ Chap. xxxvii, 40-45.

the murdered man. Theft committed by man or woman is punished by cutting off the hands of the thief. Fornication in both sexes is punished by a hundred stripes. Full measure and just weight are strictly enjoined, while taking interest for the use of money is prohibited, as are also wine and alcoholic drinks, and games of chance.

To the credit of Mohammed it must be said that he enjoined kind treatment of women and orphans. But one of the worst features of his system, and which necessarily degrades woman, is the permission of polygamy, each Moslem being allowed to have four* wives at once, and to divorce them with great facility. But although the Koran degrades woman it does not exclude her from heaven. "But he who doeth good works—be it male or female—and believes, they shall enter into paradise." Slavery is authorized in the Koran, but the slave is allowed to redeem himself.

That Mohammed accomplished some good must be acknowledged; but an impartial judge must decide that the system of the Koran has been an incubus upon civilization and upon intellectual and moral progress. We coincide with the judgment of Sir William Muir:

First, polygamy, divorce, and slavery are maintained and perpetuated, striking at the roots of public morals, poisoning domestic life, and disorganizing society. Second, freedom of thought and private judgment in religion are crushed and annihilated. The sword still is and must remain the inevitable penalty for the renunciation of Islam. Toleration is unknown. Third, a barrier has been interposed against the reception of Christianity. They labor under a miserable delusion who suppose that Mohammedanism paves the way for a purer faith. No system could have been devised with more consummate skill for shutting out the nations over which it has sway from the light of truth.†

* Chap. iv, 3.

† Muir's *Life of Mohammed*, p. 535.

Henry M. Harman

CHARACTER: A SYMPOSIUM.

CHARACTER AND HEREDITY.

THE researches of the last thirty years have projected with peculiar force the word "heredity" into our speech and its deep meaning into our life. Like words which stand for truth, it is becoming weightier as knowledge broadens. First deemed important in respect of the differentiation of species and of the tendency to return to a supposed or proved older type, it has forced itself into the vocabulary of those who write of man in his physical, social, intellectual, and religious aspects.

Christian thinkers have been slow in adopting it as a part of their intellectual furniture, because they feel bound to maintain, first of all, the freedom of the will in man. There is no Christianity without this, only fatalism varnished with Christian ethics. Some authorities have carried the doctrine of heredity so far that man, in their hands, has seemed to be little more than the conscious automaton of Huxley — his whole career being found "seminally," as the old theologians used to say, in his ancestry. Those who know what scientific candor is admit that it is far more difficult to trace hereditary influences in man than in other animals. Humanity has never yet been bred even toward a physical ideal. Yet the studies of Galton and others show that, taking long periods of family life together, ability, not to say genius, is hereditary. And in respect of tendency toward high moral quality, the experienced can point out families in which it has been manifest for several generations.

If character be the sum of qualities which distinguish one person from another, Christians must find place therein for personal will and choice. They hold that man makes himself even while other forces seem to build him. Drifts, tendencies, aptitudes, pronenesses, proclivities, bents, biases, inclinations, propensities, trends, are heritable. But the personality chooses whether to drift or to row, whether to incline until it falls or to stand like the tower of Pisa, inclined but stable. This is by no means the new doctrine of fate as preached by the ultra-scientific and adopted by the modern Buddhist cult. This

last has never had better expression, even by Emerson, than in the following poem by Frederick Petersen:

"I met upon the woodland ways,
At noon, a lady fair.
Adown her slender shoulders strays
Her raven hair;
And none who looks into her eyes
Can fail to feel and know
That in the conscious clay there lies
Some soul aglow.
But I, who meet her oft about
The woods in morning song,
I see behind her, far stretched out
A ghostly throng:
A priest, a prince, a lord, a maid,
Faces of grief and sin,
A high-born lady and a jade,
A harlequin;
Two lines of ghosts in masquerade,
Who push her where they will,
As if it were the wind that swayed
A daffodil.
She sings, she weeps, she smiles, she sighs,
Looks cruel, sweet, or base;
The features of her fathers rise
And haunt her face
As if it were the wind that swayed
Some stately daffodil.
Upon her face they masquerade
And work their will." *

In this poem there is no place left for the individual will. It says poetically what Lys says physiologically, that we have no ideas at all except those which reach us through the senses, and which are compounded by machinery whose force is modified by inherited energy or weakness, and whose direction is determined by drifts in the brain itself.

What reasons have we for rejecting such teaching? Far more attractive than the old fatalism, because its foundation comes within the range of the senses, it cannot be driven away by mere denial, nor does it easily surrender to a scripture text. It is certain that in the microscopic spherule which we call an egg the development and destiny of an individual is largely, if not chiefly, inclosed. Our finest processes fail to

* *Lippincott's*, June, 1887.

accurately distinguish between that which may develop into a dog and that which has the potentiality of humanity. Yet the dog and the man are there, and neither will develop into the other. Though the mother-ground in which the development takes place and the generant and fertilizing energy be the same, within the spherule lie most of the differences between individuals of the same genesis. So much in these matters is seen to be of law that these differences cannot well be of accident. Long-gone forces step in to stamp feature, face, and disposition with resurrected quality. Sometimes it would seem as if the ghostly energies had united in some subtle incantation producing the typical man or woman of the family, whole generations compacted into one, and that one an animated composite photograph of past intellectual and physical life—a spirit exuberant with the endowments of many.

We may not receive, then, this modern doctrine of heredity in its relation to character, first, because so far as moral quality is concerned we are not able to separate the inherent from the extrinsic, the instinctive from the acquired. To determine what, if any thing, in respect of moral quality is hereditary, a child must be brought up by itself, separated from example, isolated as to teaching, studied as a tablet on which hereditary forces alone have written. This has surely never been done, and cannot be done. So much of moral development and manifestation depends on communication by language, sign, or touch—so much of morality is the outgrowth of our relation to others—that if it were possible to preserve alive an infant up to maturity separated from all example the very qualities sought to be observed would chiefly lie dormant and invisible. We should have a Caspar Hauser, and not a man.

The most which can be said, then, for heredity is that it creates a drift or tendency of the nature. This is a thoroughly biblical doctrine. As the Duke of Argyll has pointed out, the orthodox doctrine of depravity has its scientific basis. The evil trend is in humanity, and each generation receiving it is yet, despite all experience, philosophy, example, and religion, very imperfectly saved from wrong direction. All can recall how, in their immediate neighborhood, families can be found in which for generations certain forms of sin have abounded. The common speech with regard to such is, "It is in the blood."

But is it sufficiently considered what the effect of example is in such cases, or of the individual's knowledge that such sins have been common in the family? The family remaining together, the force of example may count for more than the transmitted taint. The case can be better studied when an individual of bad parentage is removed from his family and introduced to totally different surroundings. Training in good families and in benevolent institutions shows that tendencies can be restrained by instruction and bad blood become good blood. The Church has housed millions who "by restraining and renewing grace" have led a new and holy life. Such have found in the religious strength a stronger than hereditary power. The worst early conditions and the most mature moral failures have yielded to the religious impulse.

Secondly, we may not receive this modern doctrine of heredity in its relation to character, because of that consciousness of possible otherwiseness which accompanies all of us through life. By this I mean, that at no moment of sin have we felt compelled to do as we have done. We may have acted under impulse or after deliberation; but whenever we have thought of the matter we have known that we might have done otherwise than we did. The thought of instinct and of hereditary tendency has come in afterward as a salve to our conscience; as palliation in the court of wounded self-respect. We know that we could have chosen to do otherwise than we did because in similar circumstances we have chosen to do differently notwithstanding the pressure and stress of hereditary forces.

Fatalism in philosophy and in religion is always yielding to this consciousness of freedom. The doctrine that we are machines appears in new forms only to pass into desuetude because the instincts of thinking humanity are against it. Men would certainly be glad to be rid of all sense of responsibility and become epicureans if they could be certain that they were in the path of truth. Fatalism imitates some Christian graces with success. That the world will not accept it, even when clothed with the garb of philosophy and named with the holy name of Christ, is proof that the instinct of freedom in the personality detects the fault in the philosophy of compulsion.

Insisting, then, that no ancestral strain can compel us beyond our choice, we are ready as Christians to admit all which can

be proved as to the generated foundations of character. For the purposes of the Christian Church the fullest truth in this matter is welcome. Its relation to the doctrine of depravity has already been alluded to. The Church surely ought to hail any thing which adds dignity to life or to any of its functions. Mankind, when unmoved by the divine call, looks at life as a play-spell, a gold-hunt, a tread-mill, a wretched mystery. Christianity proclaims it a testing and a schooling. When, then, to the most imperious instinct of our nature science offers such a discipline as arises from the fact of heredity, the Church ought to rejoice. For no soul alive to the truth, or in any degree moved by intellect or conscience, will think of parentage without also thinking of qualities which ought to be transmitted and of taints which ought to be sterilized. The Christian conscience has in known cases been so victorious over instinct that conscious taint has been sacrificed at the altar of self-denial. A quickened sense of responsibility re-enforces conscience at a point where it sorely needs help.

Imperfect moral development is such a factor in society that all organizations are obliged to proceed on the certainty of weakness and wrong. Law is a proof of the failure of humanity to move instinctively toward the right. That which puzzles jurist and clergyman alike is to determine measures and moments of responsibility. The most strenuous advocate of the freedom of the will must admit the existence of some in whom hereditary taint has limited if not extinguished responsibility. The most Draconian judge is compelled to regulate penalty by his belief in degrees of responsibility, and to discharge some as irresponsible. But making allowance for these as the exceptions of the race, the mass of mankind must be treated as wholly responsible for motive and conduct. There is nothing more "solemnizing," to use the word of our fathers, than the study of divergences from the normal consciousness which develop into crankiness, eccentricity, immorality, and lunacy. The tendency of such studies is to enlarge our view of the circle of irresponsibility, and to quicken charity for those in whom an invisible evil ferment is at work.

But Christian hope exercises itself toward the confidence that heredity may yet prepare a better soil for the gospel seed than that which has thus far been furnished by the al-

liances of passion and the parentage of accident. Beautiful characters are known to all, which are not passive or negative, but active and positive in good affections and instincts. Such seem to absorb the truth as the soil the rain, and their children often seem to receive an inheritance of clear and discriminating conscience. I shall never forget the intense earnestness with which the venerable descendant of a long line of religious ancestors said in my hearing, "Next to the grace of God in my own heart I prize my godly ancestry. What I have inherited from their struggles and victories has made my own life-work the easier." There is hope that as humanity is refined by Christian culture and the grace of God such sweet souls may be increased. But they are yet too uncommon to do more than aid us in indulging the hope that an ideal humanity is not impossible. Love will be more some day than the crazy fancy of the immature. The thoughtful will look behind the mask of a fine face and detect the tainted ancestry before it stains their own transmitted life.

I am anxious to emphasize the royalty of the self-determining will, not to preserve my theology, but to uphold a truth necessary to the moral growth of the individual and the good order of society. It is a very pleasant sop to a disturbed conscience to say, "I could not help it." In moral matters I hold strongly that, though a thousand generations crowd their tendencies on me, invigorating and giving quality to my temptations, the good I see I can still choose and follow by that gracious ability granted to all men by the Holy Ghost. I believe with all my heart in a divine force in which we are immersed, which is the antagonist of all the lower forces which take on sinful quality by their misuse and excess. The Spirit of God meets all souls entering the world with a gift of divine paternal strength, the undying foe of all inherited taint and wrong tendency. He is present in the thinking and the willing of all who have not extirpated their capacity for good by disuse. He presses on and around as the sea on and around the rock it does not move. The human gorilla of the Congo, whose fury hesitates at the writhing of his victim, is stopped by the divine Spirit long enough to do justice and love mercy.

While I believe that a wave, whose crest, if not its mass, is fanatical, is now passing over the Protestant Church, I hold

that we cannot be fanatical in the extent to which we may uphold the power of grace over all influences pushing or drawing the soul to guilt. Responsiveness to bad suggestion may be largely determined by hereditary influence. But it is as certain as the existence of man himself that God's grace can make the lying truthful, the jealous considerate, the vain humble, the obstinate yielding, the sluggish active, the stingy generous, the lustful continent, the drunken sober. When I can say, "My Lord and my God," I can defeat all bad ancestries.

Sam^l A. Goodsell

ENVIRONMENT AND CHARACTER.

I was present by invitation, not long ago, at a gathering where the problem of conscience was the theme of debate. The most incisive comments were made by a man past middle life, a prominent and trusted member of a Christian Church, to whose words I listened with unqualified amazement. His thought was substantially as follows: "Character is the product of society. It is impossible in solitude. The idea of duty emerges only when another appears upon the scene, and morality consists in an amicable adjustment of personal rights. One man in possession of the globe could not possibly do wrong. The very idea would be wanting in him. But let him meet a second in his wanderings who has enjoyed the same prerogatives and at once a compact becomes necessary. Boundary lines must be drawn, and in this social limitation of personal rights we have the source and the substance of virtue." I wondered, as I listened, whether the speaker had read Herbert Spencer, but there was no allusion to the master. It was a case of unconscious infiltration and absorption, yet there could not have been a clearer and more compact statement of the Spencerian ethical philosophy, in which the origin and the rule of duty are traced to the evolution of social restrictions. I demurred to the plausible solution on the simple ground that

even the supposed single man could never be absolutely alone. He is himself a duality, composed of body and soul, with higher and lower impulses contending for the mastery. He can abuse and degrade himself. And, unless the idea of God be dismissed as a delusion, the relation between himself and his Maker must be taken into account in determining the grounds and the measure of moral obligation. At this point I arrested my answer, content to show that the social theory of right stopped short of its inevitable conclusion, even though a personal God be denied; since even then every man carries in his complex organism the conditions of moral action. In another company I would have carried the argument further. I should have insisted that upon such a theory as that advocated by the school of Spencer the divine character is itself an artificial product, based upon compromise and compact. The universe, in such a view, becomes the necessary condition and the primary ground of moral excellence in God, and we are left face to face with one of two alternatives—either that prior to the creative act moral life cannot be predicated of God, or that creation is an eternal exercise of the divine will, conscious, perhaps, but necessary and involuntary, and that in this eternal dualism of the finite and the infinite we must posit the source and the law of the divine holiness. For the agnostic this consideration will have no force; but with the Christian believer it must be decisive against what James Martineau happily calls “the theory of right by social vote.”

The ultimate, creative springs of character, like those of knowledge, are internal, not external. There is cognitive power in man, independent of, and superior to, the sensations produced upon him from without. It is needless to renew the philosophic battle of the last century. The victory rests with Kant and his successors. Knowledge is not an impersonal photographic process, tracing pictures upon a sensitive plate; it is always and primarily a creative act, in which the sensations are apprehended, rendered to order, and interpreted by the reason in man, acting from its own impulse and in accordance with its own laws. The moral life, in like manner, has its source and spring in the personal constitution of the soul. It is a profound remark of Richard Rothe—profound because it commands immediate and universal assent, demanding no

labored proof—that “an ethical fact is such only in virtue of one’s own self-determination; and therefore it is not so much an occurrence as it is an action.” I am aware that many will draw back from such a proposition, because of the conclusions to which it leads. Its maintenance compels serious changes in the systems of Augustine and Calvin. It will be labeled as Pelagianism in ethical theory, and we have not outgrown the dread of being classed with the ancient heretic. But at heart both Augustine and Calvin are in agreement with Rothe. They, too, teach that sin is always voluntary; that sin and guilt are rooted in an act of personal freedom. The Augustinian logic, however, is realistic. It regards the human race as a moral unit, Adam being its natural head, representative, and root, while the later Calvinistic theology substitutes the idea of a covenant for that of natural headship. This leads to the claim that every man was not only involved in the Adamic apostasy, but took part in it and was guilty of it—not personally and consciously, but substantially and implicitly. Moral responsibility and freedom are regarded as co-ordinate and inseparable; the debate turns on the question *where* free-will takes the tremendous initiative by which guilt is contracted. In the Augustinian system no grades or degrees of responsibility can be admitted. The full guilt of the original apostasy rests upon every soul. The new-born babe is crushed by it. The will has sold itself into absolute moral bondage. Ignorance, faulty training, the force of evil surroundings, cannot in the least mitigate the awful doom. It is inevitable, and yet self-induced.

Here, then, we have the extremes on the question of the relation between environment and character. The Augustinian theology gives to the generic human will in Adam the moral initiative. By that character was determined for all individual souls. The generic apostasy has created the bad environment. It has degraded the home, and gives the reins to the most furious passions. Man has created his own surroundings, and he cannot plead them in excuse for his offenses. No allowances can be made for the most ill-favored, neglected, and degraded individuals and races. The Spencerian ethics, on the other hand, makes character the product of environment, and so shifts the ground and measure of responsibility from the individual to society, and to the framework of existence in which society is imbedded.

A disciple of Hegel would be inclined to regard these contradictory positions as the thesis and the antithesis, each emphasizing a partial or isolated fact, while the solution of the problem is to be found, not in a compromise, but in a living synthesis of the two, in the formulating of a doctrine that shall give due weight alike to free-will and to environment. In my calmest moments I am neither with Pelagius nor with Augustine; and Paul appears to me above them both. I cannot believe any one to be born sinless; nor can I think of the infant as weighted with the full guilt of the Adamic apostasy. The evidences of the moral unity of the race are many and startling; yet the evidences are no less patent that such unity does not eliminate a present and living freedom of the will in the individual. Every soul is a moral unit, and only in its personal action is the beginning and scope of moral character; but each soul is set in an environment which it has not produced, and for which I do not see how it can be held accountable, any more than it can be blamed for being of Mongolian or Caucasian blood. I am not writing a book; I am not attempting a solution; I am only thinking aloud, and uttering thoughts that cannot be strange to my readers. I have the feeling that the methods both of John Calvin and of Herbert Spencer are too rude and sweeping, and that the problem of human responsibility requires finer discriminations than any with which we are yet familiar. It is quite probable that the solution is beyond the power of created thought, and that an impartial Judge must needs be omniscient, supplied with an infinitely exact as well as comprehensive and exhaustive knowledge. When I remember, however, that Charles Hodge, the ablest representative of Calvinism in modern times, unhesitatingly pronounces in favor of the salvation of all who die in infancy, I feel that the admission cuts the roots of the claim that there are no degrees of guilt. Plainly the new-born child is not a sinner in the same sense as is the hoary and confirmed criminal. This concession brings great relief, but the old Augustinian logic has not been adjusted to it. The theory has been left to stand, with this tremendous exception of infant salvation tacked on as an appendage. Nor can the modification stop here. Why is inherited depravity supposed to be covered by universal forgiveness and redemption? Because it is *impersonal* to

the individual subject, and the moment of *personal choice* is regarded as the turning-point in the soul's moral life. How early that may occur we cannot tell; the time seems to vary, and it probably takes place long before our attention has been arrested by the change; but in that first conscious personal choice the soul has entered upon its moral probation. Thus even the strictest orthodoxy draws a distinction between inherited and personal guilt. I do not see how the logic can stop here. The concession involves other important modifications in the doctrine of moral responsibility. The first conscious ethical choice does not introduce an absolutely new history. The influences of hereditary bias continue to operate in every subsequent choice, and the elimination of the inherited element must be carried through to the very end. Besides, inheritance is only the first, even if the most potent, antecedent of moral action. The conditions into which men are born, the associations into which they are thrown in their earliest years, the occupations into which they drift by force of circumstance, the social and political atmosphere of the time, are as independent of their personal volition as are their inherited peculiarities. Heredity and environment belong to the same category of antecedent and impersonal conditions under which men are summoned to make their moral election. They are all potent, but they are not omnipotent. They are woven into all character, but they do not exercise a fatalistic power upon any soul. One cannot plead his weakness as an excuse so long as he voluntarily surrenders to the temptation. He is bound to fight, and the best man is he who makes the best fight, whose resistance to evil is most intense and habitual, however numerous and sad his failures and defeats may be.

It has not escaped the students of history that character assumes varied forms, determined by race temperament, occupation, and forms of political life. There are some races whose besetting sin is licentiousness, and these are mainly located in countries where the necessity of exertion is not great, and where general leisure and a mild climate excite the animal passions. There are others whose frailty is the vice of drunkenness, and these are found to inhabit more rigorous climates, compelled to more exhausting and incessant toil, by which, and the attendant poverty of large classes, the craving for artificial

stimulants is greatly increased. The commercial nations develop a type of character in which veracity holds the first place; in which it is made a maxim that a man's word shall be as good as his bond. Martial states are conspicuous for self-control, simplicity, endurance, and fearlessness. The mountains and the sea have always been the retreats and chosen sanctuaries of brave and liberty-loving communities; and despotism has always intrenched itself in the great and open valleys. The English Channel and the surrounding sea are more useful to the British Empire than a standing army of a million men. The Atlantic and Pacific oceans have been among the mightiest factors of our national development. But it is acknowledged that Buckle's generalization was too sweeping when he tried to make the material environment account for every thing. The personal factor refuses to melt away in this crucible. History, after all, is made, not by inanimate things, but by living men and women. And this, again, conducts us to the conclusion that there is in man a creative force by which he seizes upon his environment and makes it subservient to his own ends.

Here I must leave the subject, inadequate and unsatisfactory as the treatment may appear. Man continues to be the greatest of all riddles. Necessity and freedom, law and choice, time and eternity, meet in him. In that unfolding fabric which we call character there are many threads held in the loom of environment, but the weaver stands behind them all, and the divine pattern is given to every soul in its primitive intuitions of right and wrong. The threads may be coarse or fine, but the weaver may do good work with the rudest, and he may mar the best. Virtue may be difficult in certain circumstances, but it is never impossible; it may be easy in a different environment, but it never can become inevitable. We are bound to do what we can to make the environment as favorable as possible; to secure to every man a fair share in the product of his toil; to check the overcrowding of the poor in tenements; to limit the ravages of intemperance by judicious and effective legislation; to promote universal intelligence; but we are never to forget that the citadel of moral power and the guarantee of permanent improvement are in the human will, whose consent and active co-operation are essential to any hopeful

progress. A nation of righteous men and women will not long live in mud huts; and a community housed in palaces, built for them by other hands, will not be long in squandering their inheritance if they choose the way of wrong-doing. The parable of the prodigal son points a double lesson. It shows how the most favorable environment may be set at naught, and how the deepest degradation may be the cradle of a godly repentance.

A. J. F. Behrends

INDIVIDUALITY.

We consider, first, the man marked out from the masses of nature by the formation of character; second, the man marked out from the masses of men by the formation of his own character. The first is the question of a *man*; the second is a question of *the* man. The first is a product which concerns us chiefly in the capacity for and process of its production; the second is a product which invites us to scrutiny of its distinct and peculiar content.

In the more general sense that is "the concrete entity with which moral science deals," and the questions of that science are about its "elements, its nature, the influences which make or mar it, its perfection and its destiny." * In that sense all history is—and is useful because it is—a museum of character. This is the supreme thing in Christian doctrine and precept. It is the sum of our manhood; the measure of our usefulness, and beneficence, and influence; the most difficult of all our attainments; the final aim of our whole education, and of the education of the race. It is our best aid in the cultivation of the mind, since the moral conditions the intellectual, and is visible in all our work. Every effort to attain it is a movement of essential vitality, and even an effort to know it is a response to the wisest oracle of old. Sir Thomas Browne said: "As for the world, I count it not an inn but a hospital, and a place not to live but to dwell in; the world I regard is *myself*."

* Shairp.

How vastly it concerns us, then, to know whether character is made for us or by us. If the former, then not a line of what has been so freely written is true. If freedom be a delusion character becomes valueless, even if it were possible. Building only what circumstances allow, we can build nothing circumstances cannot destroy. This is blank despair. "Necessity is not the irrevocable behind us, but the inevitable before us. In necessity is no intelligence, because no plan; no will, for there is no choice; no hope, for there is no escape; no responsibility, for there is no freedom."*

If all men have liberty to form character, what of the stricter individuality in its formation? The pendulum swings now over a lesser arc. Out of things a man, out of characters a character. No science of character existed among the ancients, ethical as their thinkers were, but they studied the individual instances of it carefully. There was much "delineation and analysis of character," and one work bearing this subject expressly as its title is a treatise of Theophrastus, the pupil and literary executor of Aristotle. The treatise is a short one, and contains descriptions of thirty characters, all implying "petty vices or weaknesses."

When we ask of later writers what is individual character, Mr. Samuel Bailey answers,† giving five propositions, of which one concerns the body and two the intellect, leaving only two which properly belong to the definition. The first of these is the "predominance of certain feelings," and the second "the energy or feebleness of the volitions." Evidently these contain the substance of a correct definition. It is in the realms of the affections and the will that we are to find individual character. There are the springs of action, in the appetencies and desires, and there first we encounter a moral tone, without which there can be no character.

But ought individuality in the narrower sense to be an object of desire or endeavor? Is there not more need of the common than of the peculiar? Attention has recently been called to Schleiermacher's emphasis upon the "importance of developing and manifesting those elements in our nature which make us peculiar. He wanted individuality, and thought it the mission of each Christian to manifest religion according to the

* Dr. Platt.

† *Letters on the Human Mind.*

peculiarity of his being." To become conscious of what was in them meant that they should know their "peculiar characteristics," as well as that which they had "in common with others." Schleiermacher's "freshness, originality, and inspiration" came from daring to "go his own way." * To this agrees Goethe's idea of all education. It is a development of "what lies in human nature," and this, first, in an "all-sided and harmonious culture," and second in considerations of "individuality, life-activity, and solidity."

The fact is, character can come no other way than by individuality. General influences only make very general people, flavorless and uninteresting. Shot in a shot-tower are all rounded alike by the gravitation, except as the individual sieves make the sizes and thus the uses. The law of habit enters here. If character is the sum of our moral habits it can be constructed only by the repetitions of the individual will. Then comes the law of association to make easier thinking, which makes still easier doing, and thus character arrives. The inner struggles which make a self in the peculiar and individual sense constitute the deepest fact in soul-history. "As a man thinketh so is he." Marcus Aurelius says: "Such as are thy habitual thoughts, such also will be the character of thy mind, for the soul is dyed by the thoughts." We cannot help but hew and carve ourselves out, however bunglingly, in these conflicts. We are intense in reaching this moral end and lax toward that one, drawn here and there, pulled hither and driven thither, but *deciding* always both as to what we do and as to what shall be done to us. These struggles can never have exactly the same elements in any two cases. And they can never produce exactly similar results.

There can be no danger of forgetting the claims of the average man in this matter. We desire neither the "hero" (in Carlyle's sense) nor the distorted and shrunken dandy. But for that reason we desire the average man's liberty to be himself. This is the blessing of freedom. Liberty makes men unlike. Compare Russians and the English. Nor can there be any danger of exhaustion of individual varieties under the great types. Fourier made a singular classification. Being a Pythagorean in his respect for numbers, he imitates also the classes,

* Stuckenberg.

orders, and genera of natural science down to "tenuities and minimities."

He doubles his four hundred and four varieties, after adding one to take in the main trunk, and thus makes eight hundred and ten characters, each provided with the twelve radical passions, but more or less subject to the ascendant influence of one or several.*

But what are eight hundred and ten characters to the wilderness-profusion of individuality to be found in any populous city? Only what the statue-population of Milan's cathedral is to the teeming millions of Italy. What a curious study the infinite variety of human character must be to the angels! All the zest and color and foliage of the moral universe depend upon individuality. Nature seeks it in material and form. Ripening leaves are less alike than green ones. Every integration is toward heterogeneity. The higher the product the more individuality. So it is in civilization—Greek, Roman, Chinese. So art goes. There are circles within circles, and lines which cross them all, and schools which are always breaking up into lesser groups. And all the surface freshness and variety depend upon the underlying and little-known distinctions in character. All comfort and security, given the varieties, depend upon the moral unities below, but these are the sometimes unnoticed harmonies which sustain and enrich the *melodies* which alone are heard and remembered. The general resemblances make up families, tribes, nations, and races, but within each circle how infinite the play of individuality! Spencer argues that national character is the outgrowth of national habits of life. Why do not the habits, then, extinguish the variety discernible every-where? Since it comes not from without but from within, it can and must arise every-where and persist through all conformities.

The law of individual development, as the law of life, is doing its work in the judging and test times of this world. The heroic spirit is incarnate in some individuals. The men that have been built alone can stand alone. They are the Noahs and Abrahams and Daniels of the world. They are like Moses and Elijah, Nehemiah and John the Baptist, Luther and Savonarola. "*Athanasius contra mundum*" was a most profound compliment to individuality in character. This it is

* Bain.

which is fitted for pioneer work. It crosses all social tendencies which demand subserviency to wrong,⁶ and does not understand to give "flattering titles." This makes Christians possible, who, sent into the world, are not of it but for it. This makes reformers, and makes reforms possible. The hoary wrong finds its opponent. He leads the timid and victory has begun. The personality of the martyr remains. "After martyrdom he is the same strange, intrusive, pertinacious, resistless force—active as ever—pervading the community by degrees with his peculiar life." * Our very eagerness to know details in the lives of great men bears witness to the strength of their personality. It may be said that no man can succeed without being rightly related to the life of the community—as Luther in Germany, and Zwingli in Switzerland. But let him be the truth incarnated and he shall be a "reformer before the Reformation," like Huss and Jerome of Prague. "Woe to the revolutionist who is not himself a creature of the revolution." Thus Hamilton; but we cry, "Woe to the revolution which has not first of all become incarnate in some revolutionist." Without believing in the König-mann we may believe in the incalculable power of individual character at the crises of affairs. What would history have been (modern) without the individuality of Napoleon and Wellington, Washington, Lincoln, and Grant? Who shall penetrate that secret of the Lord, the subtle correspondence between men's characters and their times? Bacon thought great success awaited the man able to divest himself of "theories and notions vulgarly received." Dugald Stewart says of such men that they are those "marked out by nature to be the lights of the world, to fix the wavering opinions of the multitude, and to *impress their own characters* on that of their age." Bain shows that

Bentham's revulsion at the system of legal procedure of his early days, by which fees were charged several times over for the same thing, and the impulse to become a social reformer that came over Fourier when he was made to throw wheat into the sea at Marseilles for the sake of raising the prices, are examples of the higher agencies of our conscientious feelings by means of which better standards are gradually forced upon mankind.

A glance at the broader relations of individuality may serve finally to fix our estimate of its place and power. It is but an

* Whipple.

easy corollary from the true doctrine of manhood, that institutions and laws and customs are meant to foster and promote it, and must be judged by their final effect upon it. They are but the chestnut-burr skillfully to inclose and faithfully to protect the close-lying and carefully nourished individuals they contain. That these things are for the man, and not the man for them, is plain from the fact that they are temporary and he is immortal. They are the scaffolding, he is the building. Individual liberty, that thing about which the world has quarreled the most and has yet an immense amount of fighting to do, in its extension and its limitation alike, is only, after all, the liberty of the individual; and if there be no individual (as there will be none except by character) there will be no liberty.

But in religion must it not be true that individuality shall cease to be at once the underlying fact and the objective point as we have seen it to be elsewhere? Are not the considerations that make a *man* here so massive that *the* man shall disappear under them? No! just the reverse. Here more than anywhere is the objective point, for *therein* lies the glory of God, as thereunder lies his image. There is nothing in the universe about which God cares so much, or by which he can be so adequately revealed, as individual character. The law of the highest type, being most individual, obtains here fully. All the elements which form character are consolidated now. Introversion is deepened in the most effective way when a man is set upon the search for his sins by an awakened conscience acting under the powers of the world to come and the vision of the cross. Higher elements are imported than men know elsewhere. Regulating power is restored. The soul is led out at the top of its faculties, as a candle's chemistry is set in operation by the burning wick. A personal result is sought infinitely beyond the all-confusing notions of pantheism and the race-immortality of positivism. Here, indeed, we are surest. Every thing in religion is meant to emphasize the dignity and value of individual character.

Sylvester H. Scovel

CHRISTIANITY AND CHARACTER.

It is not a new definition that religion, in its strict sense, is the highest spiritual force operative in the human realm; but it is well to consider if it may not be the strongest *natural* force, as compared with the commonly recognized influences in the production of character within the realm of life. It is natural, not in the sense of physical attribute or prerogative, but in respect to its inner constitution, its method of working, and its harmony with the truest idea of self-adjustment. It is not less spiritual because it is natural, nor less natural because it is spiritual. Conceding to the lower influences an accumulated potency of good or evil in their relation to character, we assert without dogmatism that without the impression of religion on human nature it must fail in its evolution to reach a maximum attainment. But that this general statement may not seem to be uttered in an *ex cathedra* spirit, or urged upon acceptance as if there were no reasons for an opposite opinion, we suggest in its behalf the following supports.

Religion, in the specific sense of Christianity, is the representative of divine law, divine truth, and divine life: it is the greatest law, the holiest truth, and the only absolute life known to man. Its law is perfect, and therefore unchangeable; its truth is the sum of all verities, primary, secondary, and final, and therefore the source of all wisdom and knowledge; its life is eternal, because the begetter of life is God. Hence the internal forces of religion are omnipotent. Religion is the expression of the might of God. Applied to humanity, the effect is resistless, uplifting, changing character by the assimilation of its spirit into a divine product which it is impossible for aught else to produce; that is, if character can be changed, which some doubt, but which the religionist affirms is consistent with individuality and divine law.

It may be said that heredity is an unbreakable law in human history; that each generation is largely what it is because it had a predecessor; that the nineteenth century is the product of the eighteenth, and that, going farther back, each individual is simply an heir of Adam in his tendencies, aspirations, and the elements of his character. It is of no consequence whether

the whole human race was in Adam or Adam is in the race to-day, so that the reign of heredity in history be accepted without dispute. We concede its influence in every life, for no man is entirely original; he is not exactly himself; he is somebody else in a measure; he is the ancestry over again in some, usually the unfavorable, particulars—a fact that makes for unity, but which is a trifle destructive of individuality. Emerson rightly says that every man is the slave of his organism; and Paul depicts this slavery as a conflict between the law of the mind and the law of the members—the old battle between soul and body. Evil carrying as is this law, burdening humanity with degradation, making every one a slave to himself, it is the province of religion to interrupt and overcome the reign of the law, or to so interact with it as to make it tributary to man's ennoblement and greatness, proving the superiority of the interacting force both as respects its function and final result. In Ezekiel xviii, 1-4, the invalidity of heredity as an excuse for character is clearly set forth from God himself: "What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; . . . *the soul that sinneth, it shall die.*" This is the doctrine of individual responsibility, heredity being set aside as an apology for sin, or as a necessary force in character. For if it is not in the power of man himself to overcome the law, there is in religion the power that makes for righteousness and is able to counteract the hereditary bias to sin. It must be clear, therefore, that religion as an instrument of character-making is superior to heredity; and also clear that, while religion can interact with any lower force, the lower force by no initial motion of its own seeks interaction with any thing higher. In the production of good character, therefore, heredity can but be a subordinate factor regulated by a higher.

The same line of reasoning applies to environment, which, unyielding and often rebellious, must be subordinated to man's will or it will prove a source of perplexity and unending mischief. Shall he subdue his environment, or suffer environment to subdue him? This implies an external, as the preceding implies an internal, conflict. Evidently the outside

slavery is not of so severe a type as the inside slavery; but, unrestrained, unregulated, unappropriated, or misappropriated, it is sufficient to undermine manhood. Any dominancy over man degrades him. It is not claimed that of himself he is wholly able to resist environment, though the human will is by no means the weak, powerless thing it is so often represented to be; nor is it claimed that religion circumvents and destroys its influence, but the rather, as in the former case, it appropriates it and turns it into a contributory force of man's elevation.

In these processes of change religion does not aim at the extinction of principles, laws, or facts; but, regenerating man, it reverses his relation to principles, laws, and facts, giving him dominion over them as they hitherto exercised dominion over him, or so relating him to them as to enable him to appropriate them to his further sanctification. Hence, he no longer fears heredity, environment, or himself, for he is master of the whole. This is the difference between the natural man and the spiritual man.

It will not be forgotten that, in the contest between the higher and lower forces, while the latter, acting for themselves, will ultimate in degeneration, the former, acting independently, will ultimate in regeneration. Natural forces, however awakening, stirring, stimulating, always come short of regenerating; as water heated into steam or vapor is water still, and never passes into any thing else. Change the intellectual temper and taste by education; refine and improve the social instincts; stimulate and enlarge one's being by all the contrivances of art, literature, and social culture, and the result will be natural character, better in degree, but not different in kind, from that of the barbaric Bushman or of the savage Sioux. Natural character is of nature, gracious character is of grace. It is not in the power of natural forces to *change* character. They may refine it, they may check the reign of the diabolical in man, they may supply a higher class of motives for conduct, they may civilize him, but they cannot Christianize him. This is the weakness of all the schemes of reform proposed as substitutes for religion—they miscalculate as to the value of natural forces, fail to recognize their limitations, and dispense with the only force competent to lift man above himself. The old civilizations of Babylon, Egypt, Phenicia, Greece, and Rome

are proof of the inability of the lower forces to exalt nations into permanency or the individual into purity.

Religion is an outside force. It is not inherited, as the Jews imagined when they said, "Abraham is our father;" nor is it the result of attrition between man and his environment, as Spencer teaches; nor is it the product of a self-produced mental illumination, as humanitarians teach; but it is a force introduced into human life by God himself, who designs, while allowing the largest liberty to the subject, to be sovereign in the earth as he is in heaven, and to pattern the race after his own ideal of righteousness. Religion is God's idea of man, not man's idea of God. It is as foreign to the heart as the leaven to the meal; but, entering, it will leaven the life as the lump is leavened. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again," said the Master. The marvel is that men, seeing the inadequacy of the natural, finding in it not a single redemptive quality or function, and hungering for the energy that relieves of weakness, should debate the requirement of the Teacher. Nicodemus is not dead. Nor is the teaching dead, or inoperative; it never was as potent as at this hour, and never so self-demonstrative as now. Dr. Uhlhorn says: "This present world was born in Wittenberg." Of a truth the Protestant world dates back to Luther's day; but the Christian world had its birthplace in Bethlehem-Ephratah. It is not Protestantism, so called, that is the crying need, but Christianity, or that religion which, ignoring the circumscriptions of men, will go, like Ezekiel's cherubim, "straightforward," until its purpose shall be accomplished. It is not one school of theology as opposed to another school of theology that is to decide the empire of religion in the world, but it is the reign of the Master himself in all hearts. In the presence of his mission, and seeing what it cost him to accomplish it, and what has come from it, and what it will yet do in the world, all theories subside, all theologies go to rest, all forces pay tribute to the one force, and the race is loyally, though slowly, becoming a servant of the Most High.

EDITOR.

ART. IV.—JOHN MILTON PHILLIPS.

FIFTY-TWO years ago last August a man of God lay dying in Cincinnati at the age of thirty-nine. Calling his children to his bedside he solemnly "gave them the charge and instructions of a parent on the verge of eternity." The departing man was Rev. William Phillips, assistant editor of *The Western Christian Advocate*. He is described as a studious, grave, loving, laborious, and effective minister, "much of a master-workman."

Next to the oldest of the children to whom he gave his dying charge was his son John Milton, born in Montgomery County, Kentucky, March 26, 1820. Bereaved of both parents in the space of four months, this son was left to shift for himself at the age of sixteen, with the responsibility of caring also for a brother seven years younger than himself. This brother, whom he fathered up to manhood, was Rev. Franklin W. Phillips, M.D., of the Illinois Conference, for some years Superintendent of the State Institution for the Blind at Jacksonville, Ill. The boy, John M., was employed in the Western Book Concern at the time of his parents' death. Three years later, at the age of nineteen, he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, to the service of which, in connection with its publishing interests, his life has been devoted almost continuously until now. From the foot of the ladder to the top he has mounted by the simple might of merit and manliness, without resort to methods by which men of less scrupulous honor seek self-promotion. The market value of his conscientious and self-denying fidelity made him indispensable.

In May, 1872, he was sitting as lay delegate from the Cincinnati Conference in the General Conference at Brooklyn, on the platform as the working assistant secretary of that body, when, without his seeking, on the nomination of twenty or thirty voices, he was elected Book Agent for the New York house with Rev. Dr. Reuben Nelson, being the first, and thus far the only, layman chosen to such agency.

Methodism has been imbued from the beginning with a purpose to utilize its laity in all advantageous ways and ordain a fair division of power. From Wesley's day forward, lay

preachers were among the most heroic and powerful promulgators of a revived Gospel in that awakening which saved the religious life of the British Isles and planted this New World with evangelic truth. The laity of our Church have a controlling voice in deciding who shall be its ministers, and are seated in the councils and boards which direct its various enterprises and activities. The first editor of *The Christian Advocate* was a layman. In view of these and similar facts it is somewhat surprising that no layman was appointed to the management of our publishing business until 1872.

The possible advantage to the Church of one lay book agent is obvious. Business training is more probable in laity than in clergy. Although in large measure our publishing interests have need of ministerial supervision, there must be strong and peculiar reasons why, for over three quarters of a century, the book agency was not once committed to a layman. A few facts bearing on the matter readily suggest themselves. The supreme council of the Church generally fills offices from its own membership, and laymen were not in it before 1872. It has not been the policy of the Church to pay large salaries to any of its servants, and it might be difficult to induce business men of first-class ability to forego more lucrative opportunities elsewhere by devoting themselves to a position which offers only a moderate living. In addition, there is the absence of any guarantee of permanence in the place which the agent abandons his business to accept, the question of his continuance being submitted quadrennially to the dire uncertainties of the vote of a large, new, and miscellaneous body, whose action has often nonplused the shrewdest of prophets, being subject to elemental influences which no ecclesiastical weather bureau can infallibly forecast.

It does not seem strange that a preacher's son should have been the first layman called and willing to accept a book agency, with its limitations and risks, turning aside from actual financial opportunities greater than could be found in any Church position. That his course in so doing should be but one manifestation of a spirit which has marked his entire history affords sufficient explanation of his action. Only once in a hundred years has a layman been found combining devotion and equipment for the place.

John M. Phillips did not come to 805 Broadway as a freshman, but as a graduate, instructor, and capable inspector-general. It is simple historic fact that in the hundred years of Methodist publishing work in America no other man ever brought so high qualifications from experience and training to the office of agent. His knowledge of the business was so nearly life-long that he was more familiar with its features than with those of his own face. For thirty years he had lived inside a Methodist Book Concern and grown acquainted with its work, until its atmosphere was congenial as his native air and its conditions natural as ship-board life to an admiral.

In addition to three decades of adjustment and acclimatization, the plan on which he had been providentially prepared for the agency was the only one that can insure complete mastery. Entering our Western Publishing House when but fifteen years old, his service ran into all divisions of labor, as office-boy, salesman, mailer, book-keeper, chief clerk, cashier, and general factotum—competent to direct in every department. Instead of coming into the business at the top and exploring downward, he began at the bottom and came slowly up from apprenticeship to superintendency. His knowledge had proceeded from particulars to generals by the accretion of well-studied details, one by one, to a perfectly digested body of exhaustive information. No stage of any process in the broad variations of the business in buying, making, marketing, or managing had escaped him. He had learned by touch from the roots up, and his hand was accustomed to every thing from broom to ledger and check-book.

When a man of brains, trained after this fashion, looks at the business from his position of superintendence, the inwardness of things is transparent to him. As a skilled anatomist who has dissected all organs and tissues of the human frame looks on a man and sees through him, perceiving with his mind's eye the total contents of the body, so does John M. Phillips's insight penetrate the affairs he conducts. He knows the entrails of the business. Moreover, he is equally familiar with the practical operation of the parts, like an engineer who understands the machinery he runs by taking it apart, putting it together, and experimenting with it till he has developed under his own eye and hand all its possibilities and liabilities. His

training also included experience in business circles outside the Book Concern. For four years in Cincinnati he was President of the Union Central Life Insurance Company, and held a like office in the Farmer's Fire Insurance Company.

The reputation of Mr. Phillips as a man of proved ability and integrity, which led the General Conference to his election, had preceded him from his important and responsible position in the western house, and secured for him an exceptionally respectful reception in New York; and now, after sixteen years, the oldest employees say, "The respect which we felt for him at first has continually increased and ripened into high esteem and honor." They appreciate the reasonable conservatism of his character, the justness of his judgment, and the kindness of his heart. His advent to the agency had been preceded by four years of intense controversy over the condition and management of the New York Concern. By some it was advised that a sweeping change be made in the *personnel* of the entire force; but Nelson & Phillips declined to adopt so radical a policy, and determined that all who were capable and worthy should be retained, and no one be dismissed except for definite cause. While thoroughly faithful in guarding the interest of the Concern as supreme, Mr. Phillips is so considerate of the welfare of its workmen as to win their grateful regard. But as they are sure of a just estimate of their merits, they are equally aware of a critical perception of their defects, for he is not blind to faults of character, capacity, or performance. As a sample of his frankness, he told a valuable clerk that while he considered him an excellent salesman he had no confidence whatever in his knowledge of accounts, and would not trust him under any circumstances with a column of figures; while of another, who is, like himself, a splendid accountant, he said, "He would starve to death if he had to sell goods for a living."

Though not given to a familiar intercourse with his employees, when the pressure of business is off he shows the genuine friendliness of his nature, and the presence of the master disappears in the good-fellowship of the companion.

He is a wise disciplinarian, maintaining the tone of service more by force of example than by prescription and reiteration. Methodical in his habits, assiduous in duty, always at his post, his own inexorable fidelity furnishes daily an influential model.

Although it must insist on the punctuality and order necessary to a vast business, the discipline of the establishment succeeds in being intelligently flexible, and adaptive rather than mechanically rigid; the aim being to get the best from every one; requiring results and allowing reasonable scope to personal peculiarities in ways of working.

The varied and striking qualifications of J. M. Phillips have deeply impressed his fellow-laborers. In book-keeping he is an expert of the first order, subjecting the accounts to personal scrutiny, and readily detecting the slightest error. He accepts no set of figures without testing them by his own independent computation. Our eastern publishing house supports the statement of the venerable James P. Kilbreth, of Cincinnati: "I venture the opinion that New York city can furnish from among its many accomplished accountants no man more fully competent than he to conceive and maintain the safe and perfect system essential to the management of a mixed and extensive business like that of the Book Concern."

He is a keen and experienced buyer. An old adage says, "Goods well bought are half sold." Mr. Phillips's skilled judgment of paper is such that dealers cannot deceive him as to quality or value; and it is said that his technical knowledge of all materials used in manufacturing enables him to save annually to the Concern, by wise purchasing, an amount equal to several times his salary.

Of the mathematics of the enormous business of which he is one of the superintendents it is safe to say he is easily master. Gifted with a positive genius for figures, and a day-and-night propensity for combining, analyzing, and permuting them, his passion for calculation is so active that he appears to employ his leisure in figuring merely for recreation's sake.

A tenacious and trustworthy memory for the points, decisions, and reasons in past transactions enables him to bring forth correct impressions from the dark closets of recollection, as a photographer takes down old negatives from dusty shelves. To all negotiations he brings abilities of such an order that the ablest merchants and financiers with whom he deals perceive in him no inferiority.

One says that Mr. Phillips would make a superior judge in a court of arbitration for business men where difficult questions

were submitted for decision on purely business principles. Rufus Choate was once sorely vexed because, in an important mercantile case in which he was chief counsel, he had a jury of farmers and drovers, totally incapable of deciding the merits of a complicated commercial transaction, or even of comprehending the terms and phrases used to describe it. When his client inquired what the prospect was he answered, "O, the law is on our side strong, but what those bovine and bucolical gentlemen from Berkshire will say no man knows." A jury of men like John M. Phillips would have delighted Choate's heart if his cause happened to be a sound one, but would have been fatal to him if it contained any sophism or mistake. Especially any erroneous statement including a mathematical element would have been unerringly detected and exposed.

Mr. Phillips's power to dissect and comprehend intricate accounts and involved transactions is made still more useful by remarkable ability to make such things plain to the average understanding. His faculty for simplification renders his explanations lucid and convincing. Nothing in their way could possibly be more admirable than his financial statements before the Book Committee, or the Missionary Board, or an Annual Conference, or a congregation. Dr. Curry again and again expressed his admiration and envy of this masterly ability. The arguments conveyed by it have settled many a debate.

Since 1879 he has been Treasurer of the Missionary Society, in which office eight or nine millions of dollars have passed through his hands, with no room for supposing that one person ever suspected for a moment any looseness in the handling of the funds or inaccuracy in the accounts. He is of the highest value, not only as a perfect treasurer, but also as an experienced and judicious counselor in the board, his large knowledge being always available. To the views and votes of this board, as to the decisions and orders of all directoral bodies, he instantly and amiably adapts himself, with no show of stubbornness or pride when his own plan or preference is overruled. In 1884 he was appointed by the board to make a tour of inspection with Bishop Harris among our Mexican missions. He traveled in Mexico about twelve hundred miles, visiting all important stations except Miraflores, and on his

return gave, at Conference anniversaries and on other occasions, an interesting account of his observations and impressions.

In 1888 the Mexican Conference paid him the compliment of electing him to represent it as lay delegate in the General Conference. He was officially appointed to the Ecumenical Conference of 1880 in London. The reason why he failed to go was given in this form: "I did not see what I had to do there, and I knew I had plenty of work at home."

Although a man of positive opinions, and ready to contend therefor, Mr. Phillips is so reasonable withal, so cool, fair-minded, prudent, and worthy, as to provoke little or no personal antagonism. His speech and behavior indicate a sensible and modest gentleman who does not think of himself more highly than he ought. When one of the bishops congratulated him at the General Conference in Philadelphia on the "magnificent vote" he had received, he replied: "This is not the first time my friends have thought more highly of me than I deserve;" to which the bishop responded: "I know by experience what that feeling is."

The book agents are well known, officially, to the Church at large by visiting the Conferences. The impression made by John M. Phillips in these visits is that of a thoroughly capable business man. An agent's task in addressing a Conference is not, as a rule, over-pleasant to himself. The hearing given is often brief and scantily courteous. Regular business being intermitted, the members sometimes make it an opportunity for conversation, moving about, or slipping out. Veteran speakers find it occasionally a trying ordeal. Agent Phillips, by simple, direct, clear, and concise statements, shows that he knows his business and is ready for any question. He has been heard to say that if he can get the eye and ear of one man, in the rustle, buzz, and confusion of the uneasy assembly, he can anchor to him and go on with his statement unperturbed.

Of necessity the agents must be unsocial in business hours. Few offices are so exposed to invasion and interruption by persons having no particular business there as some of those in the building which is head-quarters for all the Church, and a social resort for thousands of ministers and laymen from all parts of the civilized and uncivilized world. Accordingly, Mr. Phillips in his office, with many weighty and urgent mat-

ters on his mind, wears an intent and absorbed look, which most people instinctively feel it is best not to interfere with. Some who knew Daniel Curry only in public, where they saw at times his rough, severe, dogmatic, and audacious ways, were surprised to be told that in private and social circles he was one of the sweetest, most charming, and lovable of men. John M. Phillips in private and among his friends is no less mellow and genial; a man of fine feeling, with enough of poetic light and sentiment in his soul to suggest the thought that it proves after all not wholly inappropriate that this hard-headed man of facts and figures was named John Milton. He has a memory for literature and rhyme as well as for statistics and business points. A stranger, finding him at times as dry and reticent as General Grant, might not suspect that there is in him, as in most healthy natures, a vein of humor, a quiet relish for racy morsels of fun, a fondness for bright-pointed stories and a gift for telling them, a cheeriness, when no shadows lie on heart and home, which makes his talk, in off-duty hours of converse, juicy and, as Emerson says, "nutritious."

In the local churches where he has held membership he has been class leader, steward, trustee, and Sunday-school superintendent. In the building of St. Paul Church, Cincinnati, he was treasurer, and when there were no funds in hand pledged his individual credit for thousands of dollars that the work might go on. For sixteen years he has been a strong pillar in St. John's Church, Brooklyn, as trustee and treasurer, for years as Bible-class teacher, as usher in the aisle Sunday mornings and evenings, as spokesman in addresses of welcome to new pastors, as one of the young people dropping in at their association meetings and sitting down with the rest of the young men; valued and honored by all.

In person he is above the average height, with broad shoulders somewhat rounded under the loads of life. The habitual expression of his face is grave and judicial. Ritchie's fine portrait of him might be that of a senator, or judge, or bank president. For an untitled man he wears a great many titles. He often passes as "the Rev. Dr. Phillips." His picture, hanging with others in a photographer's frame in the vestibule of the last General Conference, was so labeled. *Zion's Herald* recently called him "the Hon. John M. Phillips," and told

more truth than usually goes with that title. He is sometimes taken for a bishop, and no doubt would have made a good one. Not long ago, in a restaurant, a stranger looking at him inquired if that were not a Methodist bishop.

In the year 1888 two great events in the metropolis called universal attention to the march and magnitude of Methodism: the sessions of our twenty-fifth General Conference in the most capacious and splendid audience-room in the city, and the laying of the corner-stone of the new Book Concern and Mission Building, largest of its kind on earth, a mighty pile, now rising on a site unsurpassed for eligibility. Of the General Conference Mr. Phillips was treasurer to the commission on its entertainment. At the laying of the corner-stone, in presence of city officials and delegates from all parts of the world, he fitly presided as chairman of the Building Committee.

Already he has been Book Agent at New York longer than any man except Thomas Carlton. A successor of such men as Ezekiel Cooper, Joshua Soule, Nathan Bangs, John Emory, Beverly Waugh, and Levi Scott, he has held his place so firmly as to be practically without competitor, being re-elected by acclamation in 1876, and receiving an almost unanimous vote at each election since. He has labored in utmost brotherly harmony with his honored ministerial associates, Dr. Nelson for seven years, and Dr. Sandford Hunt for nine years, in the management of a gigantic business which has flourished increasingly for a century and has a great future before it.

In 1836 an aged Kentucky Methodist wrote: "We have not known a more excellent and profitable man than Brother William Phillips." As was the father so is the son. The Methodist Episcopal Church can hardly expect to be served by a more efficient, safe, and unobjectionable officer.

William V. Kelley,

ART. V.—THE ATONEMENT AND THE HEATHEN.

CHRISTIAN doctrines are correlative and mutually dependent. No doctrine can stand alone, but must both act and be acted upon by other doctrines. Each stands to the others as part to the whole, and the whole and its several parts are determined by the correlative influence of each. It is this fundamental fact which makes possible and necessary systems of faith. To believe one doctrine will lead to belief of another, and a change in any essential part of our faith will logically lead to a modification of the rest. We recognize this truth in all doctrinal discussions, and hence are cautious of conceding a new position lest it militate against an older and more fundamental truth.

The history of Christian doctrine exemplifies the same fact. The great historical systems of belief are built upon it. The reason is manifest: it is the logical principle. Given certain premises, we must always reach, if consistent, certain conclusions. So postulates in doctrines necessitate corollaries and inferences. Hence, along the line of this principle do we trace the development of various systems of theology, as Pelagianism, Socinianism, and Arminianism, the leading and comprehensive creeds of Christendom.

One of the most decisive doctrines in any system is the atonement in Christ. The view of this doctrine has determined every creed. Notably, a limited atonement is but a link, and a necessary link, in the chain of Calvinism. Without it this system of faith cannot exist, nor could ever have existed. But in the systems of Augustine and Calvin it was a part perfectly fitted to the whole. While being influenced by, it has been determinative of, every other part of this faith, as, for instance, the damnation of reprobate infants with the rest of the non-elect.

The same is true to-day. The view of the doctrine of atonement, if one is logical and consistent in his belief, will determine one's entire creed. It must be intimately connected with a consistent view of the present and future condition of the heathen.

The Andover theology fully recognizes this fact of the relation of the atonement to the heathen world. In reference to this very subject the authors, in *Progressive Orthodoxy*, say:

It is especially true of eschatology that correct views depend on the conceptions one has not only of the several truths, but of the very character, significance, and tendency of the Gospel as a whole.

This is but a sample of an assumption which pervades this entire series of Essays. We may not be surprised, therefore, to find, in their teaching, a doctrine of atonement in logical consistency with their doctrine of probation. This we do find.

Such a doctrine lies in making the moral influence of the atonement an essential part of the mediation of Christ. This doctrine is not only consistent with, it necessitates, a future probation. This is manifest from the fact that all in probation must come under the essential benefits of the atonement. This is the position of the Andover teaching. Therefore, assuming the moral influence of Christ's atonement to be an essential part thereof, they conclude, legitimately, that all men in probation must come under this influence, and hence must know the historic Christ; else the essential benefits of the atonement are not universal in their application. This is logically inevitable. Given their moral influence view of the atonement, which is that it is a co-ordinate and essential part of Christ's work, there is no alternative but their conclusion. This is the reason of all their assertions to the effect that if the atonement is universal all men must somewhere in probation have a personal relation of knowledge to Christ.

We are prepared to assert, for the same reasons, that any teaching that makes the moral influence of the atonement, in any sense, a cardinal or essential element is freighted with the same consequences. Such, therefore, is the logical bearing of the following passage from Pope. Speaking of the sacrificial, rectoral, and moral influence doctrines, he says:

These three views, or, to use modern language, theories, of the atonement are combined in the Scriptures; neither is dwelt upon apart from the rest. The perfect doctrine includes them all. Every error springs from the exaggeration of one of these elements at the expense of the others.

We may add, by way of correction, that this new error with which we are dealing springs not from an exaggeration of one of these elements at the expense of the others, but from co-ordinating the moral influence element with the other results

of the atonement, as does Dr. Pope. His doctrine abounds in this same error with its logical sequence, although not carried out. The same is the result, logically, from an article in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* of April, 1884, in review of Dr. Miley. The author is Dr. John J. Tigert, of Vanderbilt University, Tenn. Quoting an old instructor, he says:

Here Dr. Summers has most felicitously combined all the elements of truth in the three great theories of atonement, Satisfaction, Governmental, and Moral.

The entire article is in support of this position. We quote once again in order to show the general drift of much current Methodist teaching in the line of this ill-fated doctrine. The Rev. Thomas Stalker, of Owosso, Mich., says:

Dr. Bushnell bases the necessity for the atonement exclusively on moral grounds. Dr. Miley mainly [he should have said *wholly*] on governmental grounds. To us it seems as if these great thinkers had omitted the most important part of the foundation, namely, the palpable facts of God's and man's moral nature.

By the palpable facts of God's moral nature we presume he means a necessity in God for expiation. By the facts of man's moral nature he means "man's consciousness of guilt" and "ill-desert." Evidently this last thought expresses but a certain phase of moral influence.

Such, then, is some teaching outside of Andover whose Andover conclusion has not, perhaps, been foreseen. But, happily for us, we are not driven to their anti-scriptural probation from the fact that there is no necessity of including the moral influence of the atonement as, in any sense, cardinal or essential. And this, without apparently any thought of avoiding the false conclusion, is the doctrine of Dr. Miley on the atonement. Fully recognizing the healthful moral influence of the atonement—and this he recognizes as fully as any one—he yet denies that it is any part of atonement as such. It is in his system an incidental though beneficial result as far as it extends. One or two quotations will not be out of place. Under the heading, "Truth of Moral Influence," he says:

The real issue with the Socinian scheme does not concern the truth of a helpful moral influence in the economy of redemption. This any true doctrine of atonement must fully hold. The issue

is against making such influence the only form and the sum of redemptive help; *indeed, against making it a constituent fact of the atonement as such.**

Again :

Thus the question of a helpful practical lesson in the economy of redemption is not one respecting its reality, but one respecting its place. The doctrine of a real atonement for sin gives the fullest recognition to such a moral influence, and represents its greatest possible force.†

There is much more of the same thought. The author, as is well known, grounds the necessity for atonement in the moral government of God. Now, assuming the author's position to be the correct one, the necessary conclusion of any probation beyond this life is excluded, so far as this doctrine is concerned. It is not necessary, it is true, on the ground of the sacrificial theory, technically so-called; but this, in every phase of it, is to be excluded for other and equally valid reasons. But without the same objections—indeed, without any proper objections either from Scripture or reason—the theory of Dr. Miley comes in to relieve us of the necessity of the unscriptural doctrine of a future probation, to which the Andover professors have been so consistently driven by their theory of moral influence. There is no denial of a certain satisfaction to God, as there is none of a true moral influence. Nor does the doctrine deny God's natural and eternal hatred of sin, but maintains that this of itself was no bar to the forgiveness of sin without an atonement, and makes all satisfaction to God in the work of Christ a satisfaction to divine justice in moral government. The purpose of the atonement was, in this view, that God might be just, and yet, as moral Ruler, consistently with his honor and the demands of his government, justify the guilty.

Let us trace out a consistent, and, perhaps, the true, relation of the heathen to the atonement as thus understood. Observe, we do not claim that this doctrine necessarily excludes a future probation, but that it excludes the *necessity* of such probation from any necessary connection with the atonement as such; a thing, as shown, not possible under the misplaced notion of moral influence.

As already suggested, the atonement, according to this doc-

* *Atonement in Christ*, p. 125. Italics my own.

† *Ibid.*, p. 126.

trine, removes simply the governmental barriers to man's forgiveness. Its purpose, therefore, is justification, of course, with the ultimate view of regeneration. But its immediate work is to make possible justification—to take away the difficulties between God's compassion and man's forgiveness. These difficulties being removed, the way is open for the Holy Spirit, on proper conditions, to work the work of regeneration. Until man is pardoned this is impossible. But, pardon being granted, the Spirit is free, so far as any atonement considerations are concerned, to perform its beneficent work upon the unregenerate nature. As is well known, the Andover theology takes for granted that the work of the Spirit is only possible on condition of the light of the Gospel. For example :

Historic Christianity alone offers sufficient *material* in motive, in the life, death, and the resurrection of our Lord, for the natural and efficacious work of the Holy Spirit.*

This will come up in due place. For the present it is sufficient to say that the atonement removes all the governmental barriers, in the divine moral administration, to the forgiveness of sin and to the work of the Holy Ghost in regeneration.

Now, according to this view, the essential benefit of the atonement can extend to the heathen without the parallel light of the historic Christ. It is admitted that, for the present life, there would be a benefit to the heathen did he come under the moral influence of Christ's life and death. But this life is small in the great plan of God for eternity ; and, if they come under the possible eternal benefit, clearly the absence of the other and temporal benefit is but a trifle in the comparison. Yet it is great enough to nerve the arm of missions. But, relatively to the eternal benefit, it is manifestly very small.

This is not to be forgotten in this whole discussion. If the heathen came under any fair conditions of the essential work of the atonement, its temporal and incidental moral influence benefit is not, comparatively speaking, a great loss. But making the moral influence of the atonement an essential benefit, which we maintain it is not, the Andover teaching reaches a contrary, though consistent, result.

At this stage we feel bound to maintain that this moral influ-

* *Progressive Orthodoxy*, p. 116.

ence is but an incidental, and not an essential, part of atonement, designed to show its bearing upon the present and future condition of the heathen. And this will appear from the fact that we by no means admit the mode of regeneration suggested by the Andover theology as the only possible, or even necessary, mode.

To begin at this point, it can by no means be shown that a Christian standard of morality is the only sign of regeneration. This, however, the Andover creed assumes. That this is not so is manifest from several facts. One is, that the saints of the Old Testament notably did not measure up to the standard. Abraham we know twice undertook to deceive, without, apparently, any remorse for either offense. Noah's drunkenness and shame, so far as we know, provoked no self-condemnation. Jacob never seemed to think his supplanting worthy of demerit. And yet, were not these regenerate sons of God?

Another fact. Many of the Christians of early New Testament times were written to by the apostles in such a way as to indicate that their morality was far below, not only the Christian standard of the gospels, but what is demanded in this day as essential to membership in the Christian Church. And yet they are addressed as Christians and saints, and hence as regenerate sons of God. For example, in 1 Cor. vi, 15-20, we have this passage (R. V.):

Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I then take away the members of Christ, and make them members of a harlot? God forbid. Or know ye not that he that is joined to a harlot is one body? for, The twain, saith he, shall become one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body.

This, and more like it, both in this and the second epistle, ceases to be strange when we remember the moral condition of the Corinthian society in which these Christians lived, and in which many of them took an active part but so shortly before. This condition is indicated by the fact that to "Corinthianize" was a proverbial expression signifying to debase morally. Is

there any wonder, then, that they were not immediately elevated to our standard of morality? or that the apostle found it necessary to write to them as in the passage quoted? The apostle does not deny their regenerate sonship, but simply sets up a standard of morality for them, urging them to measure up to it; signifying, of course, that a failure to try to measure up to the standard of light given would no doubt exclude them from the kingdom of heaven. But the very fact that such advice was necessary proves both a low state of moral conception and practice. Withal they were Christians.

Take two similar passages—the first from Eph. iv, 17-32:

This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye no longer walk as the Gentiles also walk, in the vanity of their mind, being darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them, because of the hardening of their heart; who being past feeling gave themselves up to lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness. But ye did not so learn Christ; if so be that ye heard him, and were taught in him, even as truth is in Jesus: that ye put away, as concerning your former manner of life, the old man, which waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit; and that ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, which after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth. Wherefore, putting away falsehood, speak ye truth each one with his neighbor: for we are members one of another. . . . Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have whereof to give to him that hath need. Let no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth, but such as is good for edifying as the need may be, that it may give grace to them that hear. And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you.

The other passage is from Col. iii, 1-10:

If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, *who* is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory. Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, the which is idolatry; for which things' sake cometh the wrath of God upon

the sons of disobedience; in the which ye also walked aforetime, when ye lived in these things. But now put ye also away all these; anger, wrath, malice, railing, shameful speaking out of your mouth: lie not one to another; seeing that ye have put off the old man with his doings, and have put on the new man, which is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him.

We do not mean to indicate that the people of these churches were generally guilty of all the crimes enumerated, but simply the fact that such writing was necessary signifies, as was before stated, in some cases both a low moral conception and practice; far below, perhaps, the average Christian Church of to-day.

Indeed, to consider the thought from still another standpoint, suppose we should make the gospel standard of morality the test of our regeneration, how many of us, measured by it, could claim to be regenerate? Even the Andover professors lend us aid here. "Men usually," they say, "know better than they do. The best of men are the most penitent, for the elevation of their moral standard outstrips even their improvement in conduct."

Why, then, determine the regenerate state, or the condition of sonship among the heathen, by the Christian standard of morality? Not only will not our state, but, as we have seen, not even that of the Old Testament patriarchs nor that of the early Christians, bear this test.*

The fact is, the morality of the life is to be determined by the measure of the light possessed. And yet, as shown, our regenerate life is not to be determined by even this; for if so we all, perhaps, would be found wanting. If living up to the moral light possessed cannot be the determinative sign of our sonship, why make it the infallible test of the sonship of the heathen?

Now, it is possible, as we conceive it, for the heathen to be justified, perhaps regenerate, sons of God, while the moral life is not only not up to Christian standards, but even not up to the standard of the light of nature.† Who can say that the millions of devout though superstitious heathen who do not measure up to the possibilities of the moral life which we conceive to be possible under the illuminating influences of gospel light, are not acceptable with God?

* This may be dangerous teaching.—EDITOR.

† This is contrary to an orthodox conception of the Scriptures.—EDITOR.

This position is so important, that a quotation from Crooks and Hurst's *Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology*, bearing directly upon it, and indirectly upon its application to the heathen, will here be in place :

While religion and morality coincide in their highest development, so that a true religion without morality and a true morality without religion are equally inconceivable, they are yet clearly distinguished in their details as well as in their general character. A genuine piety is found to exist in which the moral element leaves much to be desired, but which cannot be justly rated as hypocrisy; and there are many poorly behaved and ill-bred children of God who yet know that God is exercising discipline over them, and submit to his authority. This was true of David and other Old Testament characters. Without this presumption it becomes impossible to understand the Old Testament as a whole, and also the Middle Ages, with their profound apprehension of God and their boundless immorality.

The period of the Reformation and modern pietism might also furnish illustrations of this point. On the other hand, the piety of many is put to shame by the existence of a praiseworthy and correct morality, which has grown beyond a mere legality, and become moral self-respect and self-control, in a measure compelling approval and admiration, which yet lacks the sanctions and impulse of religion; that is, a definite relation toward God and eternity. This applies not only to the stoicism of the ancients, but also to the categorical imperative of Kant, and the morality of cultivated persons in our day. While, therefore, morality and religion belong together, and in their ultimate development must coincide, they may yet be logically distinguished, and bear a separate character in the lower stages of their development even in actual life.—Pages 30, 31.

Drummond, in his *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, devotes a whole chapter, under the title of "Classification," to showing the difference between morality and religion, particularly with reference to the existence of a high standard of the former separate from the latter. His opening illustration is so beautiful that we give it here :

On one of the shelves of a certain museum lie two small boxes filled with earth. A low mountain in Arran has furnished the first; the contents of the second came from the Island of Barbadoes. When examined with a pocket lens, the Arran earth is found to be full of small objects, clear as crystal, fashioned by some mysterious geometry into forms of exquisite symmetry. The substance is silica, a natural glass; and the prevailing shape is a six-sided prism capped on either end by little pyramids modeled with consummate grace.

When the second specimen is examined, the revelation is, if possible, more surprising. Here, also, is a vast assemblage of small glassy or porcelaneous objects built up into curious forms. The material, chemically, remains the same, but the angles of pyramid and prism have given place to curved lines, so that the contour is entirely different. The appearance is that of a vast collection of microscopic urns, goblets, and vases, each richly ornamented with small sculptured discs or perforations which are disposed over the pure white surface in regular belts and rows. Each tiny urn is chiseled into the most faultless proportion, and the whole presents a vision of magic beauty.

Judged by the standard of their loveliness there is little to choose between these two sets of objects. Yet there is one cardinal difference between them. They belong to different worlds. The last belong to the living world, the former to the dead. The first are crystals, the last are shells.

We propose to inquire whether among men, clothed apparently with a common beauty of character, there may not yet be distinctions as radical as between the crystal and the shell; and, further, whether the current classification of men, based upon moral beauty, is wholly satisfactory either from the stand-point of science or of Christianity. Here, for example, are two characters, pure and elevated, adorned with conspicuous virtues, stirred by lofty impulses, and commanding a spontaneous admiration from all who look on them—may not this similarity of outward form be accomplished by a total dissimilarity of inward nature? Is the external appearance the truest criterion of the ultimate nature? Or, as in the crystal and the shell, may there not exist distinctions more profound and basal? The distinctions drawn between men, in short, are commonly based on the outward appearance of goodness or badness, on the ground of moral beauty or moral deformity—is this classification scientific? Or is there a deeper distinction between the Christian and the not-a-Christian as fundamental as that between the organic and the inorganic?

Now, without pronouncing either for or against the fundamental law of this book, we yet have here a fine illustration of a fundamental fact. This, moreover, will help to account for the "exceptional cases" of morality, where there is no religion with which the Andover professors find it difficult to deal. Their cardinal mistake, in their whole argument, is in apparently identifying religion and morality, or, at least, in making them perfectly coincide.

Now, let it not be charged that we are in any sense advocating Antinomianism. Antinomianism teaches that because Christ is our righteousness, therefore we are exempt from the

obligations of moral law. Our position is simply that a moral standard of life is not the unfailing criterion of an acceptable religious life. Nor is it the proof of it. We do not claim that a religious life is consistent with a failure to strive to measure up to the standard of light possessed, or with a condition of non-penitence in each case of failure: this is Antinomianism, and, as is apparent, we by no means advocate it. Justification and regeneration are dependent upon the unceasing effort to measure up to the standard of light possessed. This, no more, no less: neither for Christian nor pagan.

Clearly, then, if this distinction be correct, millions of the heathen, with *their* "unbounded immorality," may come under all the conditions of regenerate sonship, and hence of present and final salvation. Willful disobedience under the light possessed seems the only bar to these atonement privileges.

But if, after all that has been said, it be thought by some that this position is untenable, we are still, by our doctrine of atonement, not forced to the Andover conclusion about a future probation. What is there inconsistent or inconceivable in the idea that the heathen, for the present, who meet the condition according to their opportunity, are justified without being regenerate? If it be so that regeneration, as the New Theology holds, can only be wrought by the Holy Ghost through the agency of Christian knowledge—which, as we have shown, is, seemingly, certainly, improbable—still there could be, conceivably, justification, leading those who fulfill its conditions, as they know them, on to the needful regeneration at some future time, when the necessary light can be given. This is no new second or future probation, for upon the supposition the ultimate destiny is determined in this life; only the work of regeneration is deferred until the Holy Ghost may operate through its necessary Christian light. We do not advance this as a belief, but simply as a conceivable and speculative position, which demands not the unscriptural doctrine of a future probation. This is a possible outlet from the difficulty, even granting the non-proved assertion that the regenerating work of the Holy Ghost is dependent upon the light of the personal knowledge of Jesus Christ.

There is still one other thought that is needed to be considered. The rectoral doctrine of the atonement does not nec-

essarily imply that saving faith is not possible without the knowledge of the historic Christ. It would seem, moreover, that this is the exact state of things with regard to the justification of the heathen. When it can be shown that none have ever been justified without faith in the historic Christ, then this position will have to be abandoned. Until then it need not, it cannot be. If reference be made to the Old Testament saints for proof at this point, it will be found that their justification was not dependent upon such a faith. The "New Theology" recognizes this fact, and places them among exceptional cases under peculiar conditions. This they maintain with reference to their moral and regenerate condition, together with, by implication at least, their justification. As matter of fact, Abraham and the other Old Testament saints did not believe in the historic Christ in any sense in which the Andover teachers claim faith to be necessary. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews reveals a dim faith in a *promised* Christ.

It is evident, further, that the Andover teachers are consistent with themselves, according to their view of atonement, in demanding a faith in the historic Christ. No other view is sufficient for them, nor for any, as before explained in general, who hold to their moral influence doctrine of the atonement. But the rectoral theory is free from this necessity, since saving faith, which manifestly existed among the patriarchs, may be possible under it without the moral influence of the atonement.

Now, may it not be that the principle of religious faith is the same every-where, no matter what the object, if it is coupled with sincerity and earnest striving to the degree of the light possessed? And on this condition may not God extend the benefits of the atonement in justification to millions of the heathen, if not for the present in regeneration? If God asks of no man the exercise of any faculty, religious or other, beyond the degree of his knowledge; and if the heathen, no more than we, can be justified by works, and are justified at all, why may we not—indeed, why must we not—believe it is granted to them upon the exercise of faith according to their knowledge?

To recapitulate, briefly, the position of this article is as follows: The Andover atonement, with all like it, demands in logical consistency a future probation for all who do not enjoy

one under the moral influence of Christ's life and death here. But upon the rectoral doctrine there is no such necessity. This is manifest from the fact that upon this view the work of atonement as such is simply to remove the governmental barriers to man's forgiveness. The case is further manifestly in favor of the latter doctrine from the fact that regeneration and morality do not from necessity coincide, as must be the case in the moral influence doctrine, and that saving faith, as a principle, seems separable from correct knowledge. But whether the position with regard to regeneration be thought tenable or not, there is still an easier way out of the difficulty than that adopted by the Andover teaching, by supposing the essential benefit of the atonement, which is justification extended to the heathen in this life on conditions such as they have, with a delay of their regeneration until the needed light be given. This would place the determination of the destiny of every man in this life, although the completion of his salvation would be projected into the other world. The only point claimed for this is, that it relieves us of the anti-scriptural doctrine of a future probation, and that it is of the two a more plausible supposition. It is also not inconsistent with the rectoral view of atonement.

If what is herein suggested be true, or if simply the position that a future probation is unscriptural, then the moral influence view of the atonement combated cannot be true; for, as maintained, this view necessitates a future probation for all who do not come under the moral influence of the Gospel here. Therefore, by all that is opposed to the doctrine of such a probation we may argue against making the moral influence of the atonement in any sense a cardinal or essential fact. For like reasons we may hold to the governmental doctrine, which lays upon us no such necessity.

Geo. W. King

ART. VI.—MORAL AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN
THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

THAT the founders of this nation intended it to have a distinctly religious character seems to be beyond question. The ministers were the most honored and influential political leaders, and their opinions possessed at times almost the weight of law. There is scarcely a single great national question upon which they have not left the impress of their moral force. "In a very great degree," said Charles Francis Adams, "to the pulpit—the Puritan pulpit—we owe the moral force that won our independence." The Bible was the recognized political and moral text-book. The God of the Bible was the accepted sovereign of the people, and Alexander Hamilton is reported to have said that the convention which framed the Constitution failed to recognize in that great document God or the Christian religion simply because "we forgot it." Whether the convention forgot it or not, it is evident that the majority of the members of that body, and of every representative body which delivered any utterance or adopted any resolution that has been an important factor in our history, were God-fearing and Bible-loving men, who by their actions showed that they believed this government should be founded upon religious principles.

The American colonists were schooled in the faith and practice of the Protestant forms and ideas of religion, and had a profound conviction of the essential need of religion as the only true basis of civil government. They were also inspired with an earnest spirit of intellectual as well as religious liberty, notwithstanding they did not always act up to their convictions. The statesmen of the Continental Congress officially recognized the Christian religion and incorporated its principles into their legislative acts. The first act of that Congress, which met at Philadelphia, September 6, 1774, was the adoption of a resolution "that the Rev. Mr. Duché be desired to open Congress to-morrow morning with prayer, at Carpenter's Hall, at nine o'clock."

This interesting scene was thus described by Daniel Webster in the Senate:

At the meeting of the first Congress there was a doubt in the minds of many about the propriety of opening the session with prayer, and the reason assigned was, the great diversity of opinion and religious belief, until at last Mr. Samuel Adams, with his gray hairs hanging about his shoulders, and with an impressive venerableness now seldom to be met with (I suppose owing to different habits), rose in that assembly, and with the air of a perfect Puritan said, it did not become men professing to be Christian men, who had come together for solemn deliberation in the hour of their extremity, to say there was so wide a difference in their religious belief that they could not as one man bow the knee in prayer to the Almighty, whose advice and assistance they hoped to obtain; and, Independent as he was, and an enemy to all prelacy as he was known to be, he moved that Rev. Mr. Duché, of the Episcopal Church, should address the throne of grace in prayer. Mr. Duché read the Episcopal service of the Church of England; and then, as if moved by the occasion, he broke out into extemporaneous prayer; and those men who were about to resort to force to obtain their rights were moved to tears; and "floods of tears," he says, "ran down the cheeks of pacific Quakers, who formed a part of that interesting assembly." And "depend upon it," continues Mr. Webster, "where there is a spirit of Christianity there is a spirit which rises above form, above ceremonies, independent of sect or creed and the controversies of clashing doctrines."

The same Congress, by resolution, attended divine service in a body, and regarded the Bible as such a necessary possession of the people that on September 11, 1777, it directed the Committee of Commerce to import twenty thousand copies to supply the deficiency caused by the cutting off of the supply from London by the war. In 1781, when from the existence of the war no English Bible could be imported, and no one could tell how long the obstruction might continue, the subject of printing the Bible was presented to Congress. It was referred to a committee, which recommended an edition printed by Robert Aitken, and the Congress

Resolved, That the United States, in Congress assembled, highly approve the pious and laudable undertaking of Mr. Aitken as subservient to the interests of religion; and, being satisfied of the care and accuracy of the execution of the work, recommend this edition to the inhabitants of the United States.

This was the first Bible published in the English language having an American imprint.

The members of the convention which framed the Constitution—
6—FIFTH SERIES, VOL. V.

tion, in 1787, were equally decided in expressing the dependence of this nation upon God for help and the Bible for guidance. The remarks of Benjamin Franklin, who has been and perhaps still is supposed by many to have been an atheist, are an illustration of a then prevalent feeling. The members of the convention were greatly perplexed at times by the difficulties which arose. On one of these occasions, June 28, 1787, when a "rupture appeared almost inevitable" over the question of the representation of the States in the Senate, Franklin, who was the most prominent and revered member of the body, arose and said:

The slow progress we have made, after four or five weeks' close attendance and continual reasoning with each other—our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many nays as yeas—is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of human understanding. . . . In this situation of this assembly, groping, as it were, in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened that we have not hitherto once thought of applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understanding? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayers in this room for the Divine protection. Our prayers were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending Providence in our favor. To that kind Providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? Or do we imagine we no longer need his assistance? I have lived a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid? We have been assured in the sacred writings that except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it. I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate circumstance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest. I therefore beg leave to move that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessings on our deliberations be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business.

His motion was adopted without a dissenting vote.

The influence of this speech and the action which followed it has been manifest in the practice of Congress and other legislative bodies in appointing chaplains to hold religious services to this day. Ordinarily this, to the average member of these bodies, is a perfunctory and unimpressive service, but in times of great national distress it is regarded as a proper as well as serious procedure.

The following language in the Farewell Address of George Washington doubtless expressed the general sentiment of the founders of the Republic, and should be frequently read and meditated upon by the American people:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace out all their connections with public and private felicity. Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles. It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

The foregoing facts of history indicate that the use of the Bible in the public schools has ever been in accord with the sentiments of the founders of the nation, many of whom were themselves religious men, and members of the Church. They looked upon this as a religious nation, and they expected the religion taught in the accepted version of the Bible of their day—which was that in universal use among Protestants at this time—to be the accepted principles of the people, and recognized in public institutions. Indeed, several of them expressly so declared themselves. Dr. Benjamin Rush, one of the most distinguished of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, was an earnest advocate of introducing and reading the Bible daily, as a common school-book, in all public schools and in every sem-

inary of learning. He began a paper on "The Bible as a Text-book" as follows:

Before I state my arguments in favor of teaching children to read by means of the Bible, I shall assume the five following propositions: 1. That Christianity is the only true and perfect religion, and that in proportion as mankind adopt its principles and obey its precepts they will be wise and happy. 2. That a better knowledge of this religion is to be acquired by reading the Bible than in any other way. 3. That the Bible contains more knowledge necessary to man in his present state than any other book in the world. 4. That knowledge is most durable, and religious instruction most useful, when imparted in early life. 5. That the Bible when not read in schools is seldom read in any subsequent period of life.

Gouverneur Morris, one of the foremost statesmen of the Revolution and the penman of the Constitution, was the American ambassador to France during the reign of atheism in that country. He drew up a constitution for France, one article of which was as follows:

Religion is the solid basis of good morals; therefore education should teach the precepts of religion and the duties of man toward God. These duties are—internally, love and adoration; externally, devotion and obedience; therefore, provision should be made for worship as well as education. But each has a right to entire liberty as to religious opinions, for religion is the relation between God and man; therefore it is not within the reach of human authority.

To a French nobleman Mr. Morris wrote in 1792: "I believe that religion is the only solid basis of morals, and that morals are the only possible support of free governments."

While the fathers thus recognized the importance of the influence of religion in the government, they at the same time were determined that no Church, as such, should exercise any control whatever over the government, and that every person should be allowed to worship God as he pleased, or not worship him at all if he so desired. The first amendment to the Constitution, which declares "that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," was aimed at sectarianism and not at religion. This is shown by the practice of the government in the taking of oaths, appointment of chaplains, etc., and also in the public declarations of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson, and all their

successors in the presidency, of their dependence upon God for guidance in the performance of their responsible duties.

But Pharaohs have risen up who knew not Joseph. These are mainly free-thinking foreigners, who have never been able to appreciate the religious spirit of the fathers and the extent to which their faith in God and the teachings of the Bible influenced their actions; and Roman Catholics, who are largely, though with notable exceptions, controlled by a foreign potentate who, if he had had any interest in the struggle of the Americans for independence, would no doubt have exerted his influence against them, because of their Protestantism and love of religious as well as civil liberty. But for these two elements there would never have been any opposition to the use of the Bible in the public schools. The Roman Catholic Church has always, apparently, endeavored to keep its members in ignorance, and it has for this reason opposed the public schools. But Catholic laymen, realizing by association with Protestants the benefits of education, have persisted in sending their children to the public schools, despite the efforts of priests. The result has been a striking independence of thought in secular, and to some extent even in spiritual, matters. Intelligence and Roman Catholicism do not harmonize. This is illustrated in the history of the Reformation, and more recently in Italy and France. In saying this it is not intended to ignore the piety and liberalism of many Roman Catholics both among the clergy and the laity, some of whom have blessed the Church in the past, and others are to be found in it to-day.

There is but one means by which the Catholic children can be so trained that they will continue faithful and bigoted members of that Church—that is, by taking them or keeping them from the influence of the public schools, and educating them in denominational schools; but the Catholic parochial school is a menace to the country. In order to effect this the public school system must be broken up; for the parents will send their children to the best schools, and the public schools are undoubtedly superior to the parochial schools. An excuse for an attack upon them is found in the use of the "Protestant" Bible, as they call the Authorized Version, and in the demand for its exclusion. In this demand they are joined by all infidels and many Protestants, the former opposing the Bible be-

cause they object to its teachings, and the latter because they fear that the Roman Catholics will ultimately, through truckling politicians, obtain control of the public schools and will then require the children to read their version of the Bible and teach them Catholic doctrines as to religion and government. Failing to secure their desires they have demanded a share of the public school fund, upon the plea of unjust taxation, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of their denominational schools. In New York they have secured large appropriations for various denominational purposes, and small amounts for their schools; but their demands have been so strongly resisted by Protestants that politicians have not dared to grant as much as they evidently desire to in order to secure the Catholic vote. As early as 1823 the question of distributing the fund of the "New York Public School Society," which was formed for the education of the poor and neglected children of the city, and supported in part by the State, was raised by the application of the Bethel (Baptist) Church for a portion. The society opposed the application, as being fatal to the public school system and contrary to the object of the school fund, which was intended to promote not religions, but civil, education. The Episcopalian, the Methodists, the Baptists, and the Roman Catholics at that day applied for a participation in the fund; but it is said, "the report of the committee convinced every body of 'the impolicy and injustice of such a division except the Catholics.'"

The Catholics continued their application year after year, alleging, as a reason why they should be thus favored, the use of the Protestant version of the Bible. Finally, to conciliate them, the Public School Society agreed to strike out of the school-books all passages to which they objected, and proposed to have only such portions of the Holy Scriptures read as "are translated in the same way in the Protestant and Romish versions." But these concessions did not satisfy them. Their next movement was to have the school system so extended that "Ward Schools," "under the direction of officers chosen in each ward," could be formed. Under the competition with this system the Public School Society was compelled in 1853 to transfer its property to the Board of Education. This action was regarded as a Roman Catholic triumph. At that time,

says Dr. Dorchester, "the Bible had been excluded from more than eighty of the schools of New York city."

The warfare against the Bible in the schools was not confined to New York city, but extended to a number of the leading cities of the Union. At the present time in Washington City, D. C., the Bible is used at the opening exercises each morning, and the teachers are directed by the rules governing the schools to

endeavor on all proper occasions to inculcate truthfulness, self-control, temperance, frugality, industry, obedience to parents, reverence for the aged, forbearance toward the weak, respect for the rights of others, politeness to all, kindness to animals, desire for knowledge, and obedience to the laws of God; but no teacher shall exercise any sectarian influence in the schools.

The schools of Brooklyn, N. Y., are opened in pursuance of an express rule of the Board of Education, which has been in force many years, and directs that "a portion of the Holy Scriptures shall be read aloud by one of the teachers in each department, without note or comment." In the schools of New York city the Bible is read by the principal at the opening exercises without comment. In Boston "the opening exercise in all the schools and in every class-room is the reading of a portion of Scripture without note or comment." In Newark, N. J., "it has always been and still is the custom to read the Bible at the opening exercises every morning in the day-schools, and at the close of the session in the evening schools." In the schools of Columbus, O., the Bible is generally used. If a teacher conscientiously objects to reading it to the scholars, however, he is not required to do so. There have been very few who objected. In Cleveland, O., the school board has never taken any action upon the reading of the Scripture, and the teachers may use their pleasure in the matter. In Pittsburg, the sub-district boards generally require the schools to be opened with the reading of the Scriptures, but there are schools in which they are not read. In Minneapolis, Minn., the reading of the Bible was prohibited in 1874, but was subsequently permitted, and it is now read to some extent. The Bible is also read, usually without note or comment, in the schools of Philadelphia, Baltimore, Charleston, S. C., Indianapolis, Ind., and Louisville, Ky. It is not read in the schools of Chicago,

Cincinnati, St. Louis, Detroit, Milwaukee, San Francisco, New Orleans, and Atlanta, Ga. In Cincinnati it is positively prohibited under the following rule, adopted November 1, 1869 :

Religious instruction and the reading of religious books, including the Holy Bible, are prohibited in the Common Schools of Cincinnati, it being the true object and intent of this rule to allow the children of the parents of all sects and opinions in matters of faith and worship to enjoy alike the benefits of the common school fund.

In Detroit, "many years ago it was in general use; but it was always a source of trouble, and one school after another laid it aside. It has not been in use at all for at least ten years."

Almost without exception the public schools in the rural districts are opened with some form of religious exercises—usually the reading of a passage from the Scriptures and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in concert. That the Bible has not been excluded from these schools is doubtless due to the predominance of native Americans and of American ideas as to religion and morals. Including both city and country districts, the Bible is read in about four fifths of the schools of the land.

But while the Bible has been excluded from many schools, instruction in Scripture morality is not neglected. The necessity for moral instruction is so manifest that it is required by nearly all school boards, even in those cities where the Bible is not read. The apparent decline in many places in the morals of the children attending the schools is doubtless mainly due to home influences, the parents of this generation not being as strict as their parents were, and association in tenement houses and elsewhere with all classes of debased men, women, and children who have immigrated to this country and brought with them the irreligious ideas and immoral customs and habits of their degraded European homes.

There are several methods by which moral instruction is imparted. In many schools the teachers frequently give short talks on morals, and have the children memorize and recite selections from various authors. A number of books containing suitable selections for this purpose have been prepared, and are in quite general use. Among these are Peaslee's *Graded Selections*, and Northend and Carleton's *Choice*

Thoughts and Memory Gems. The moral precepts of these books, as well as those laid down in Gow's *Primer of Politeness* and *Morals and Manners*, are based upon the Bible, and in some of them are presented in Bible language. The selections also teach the children about God and their duty to love and obey him.

There are also two volumes more recently issued, containing extracts and quotations similar in character, which commend themselves to public favor—*Excellent Quotations for Home and School*, by Julia B. Hoitt, deputy superintendent of instruction in California, and *A Primer of Memory Gems*, by George W. Hoss, teacher of Elocution, Oratory, and English Classics in Baker University. Milton's mind, stored in youth with just such thoughts from the Greek and Roman classics, was able in the days of his blindness to reproduce them, skillfully rewrought and combined, in *Paradise Lost* and *Samson Agonistes*.

The school readers also contain a number of such selections. During a careful examination of the seven readers in most general use—McGuffey's, Appleton's, Swinton's, Barnes's, Harper's, and the Franklin and Monroe Readers, a number of selections were found which expressly or indirectly teach the children that there is a God, and that they should keep his commandments. In the McGuffey and the Appleton Readers, which are more extensively used than the others, such selections were especially numerous. Among the selections in the McGuffey Readers were the larger part of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, selections from the Psalms, a story entitled "Respect for the Sabbath Rewarded," a story entitled "The Righteous Never Forsaken," a selection teaching that "religion is the only basis of society," Paul's speech on Mars' Hill, and a selection on the observance of the Sabbath. The Appleton Readers contain various selections from the Bible, among which are a number of the Psalms, the parable of the prodigal son, the twelfth chapter of Ecclesiastes, Christ's parable of the talents, portions of the Sermon on the Mount, and several selections from *Pilgrim's Progress*, besides stories, poems, etc., of a religious character. Schools using such books are not "godless schools."

The feeling that the children in the public schools should

be given instruction in scriptural morality is almost universal among public school teachers; but in view of the seeming intention of the Romanists either to control the schools or destroy them, if possible, there is much difference of opinion as to how this instruction should be given. Many sincere Christian teachers believe that really more effective work can be done if the reading of the Scripture "without note or comment" is not required, but that instead there be no rule, and the matter be left to their option. The effect of the exercise largely depends upon the teacher, one conducting it in such manner that the children will be reverently impressed by it, while another may cause them to look with contempt upon holy things.

As a class, school teachers are devoted to their work, and they regard with anxiety the possibility of the schools coming under the control of the Romish Church. They know, too, better than many persons who get more excited over the matter, the immense power of the Catholic vote in politics. This vote can be controlled as that of no Protestant Church can be, and for a time at least it can be used with powerful effect. And many politicians will yield to any demands in order to secure it for their personal benefit. It is not probable that the American people will permit it to retain power many years, but while its power lasts it may secure concessions and be granted favors that cannot be recalled. The school board of Cincinnati was in the control of the Catholics for several years, and the city is yet bearing the burdens then imposed in the interest of the Romish Church. There came, however, a reaction, and its power has been so weakened that a prominent educator of the city recently said that he believed if some teachers were to begin the reading of the Scriptures at the opening of the schools no objection would be made to it.

The strength of the Catholic opposition to the public schools should not be measured by the opposition to the Bible. Probably half of those who oppose its use are infidels and Protestants who do so to keep the hands of the Catholics off the schools altogether, and would gladly vote with others for an amendment to their State Constitution entirely prohibiting sectarian control of the public schools in any form or the sectarian distribution of the public funds. The American press

and people will protect this bulwark of our liberties from destruction.

It is possible, and, indeed, seems probable, that in most of the cities where the foreign element is in the majority the Bible will be permanently excluded from the public schools, or, at least, until immigration is restricted. In that event it will probably be restored, as the children of the second and third generations from foreign parents become so imbued with American ideas of religion and morals that, unless atheists, they appreciate the importance of Bible instruction.

In some places, where the foreign element is not so strong, and where the Roman Catholics are yet able to influence the politicians, there is a disposition to compromise on the use of the Bible by the adoption of a volume of selections from the Bible that cannot reasonably be objected to by any Church or citizen who believes in the moral law as laid down in the Bible. Rev. E. D. Morris, D.D., LL.D., of Lane Seminary, Cincinnati, has prepared such a volume, which is used in several of the schools of Columbus, O., and in other places.

While it is not probable that the Catholics will secure control of the public schools, there are numerous evidences that they are making renewed efforts to do so. Former plans having failed, they are now seeking to get a foothold by leasing for parochial schools rooms in public school buildings made vacant by the withdrawal of Catholic children. They have done this not only in Pittsburg, and perhaps a few other cities, but it has come to light that they are pursuing the same policy in villages. The friends of the public school system must be constantly on the watch. Eternal vigilance is the price of this cheap defense of the Republic as well as of Liberty.

David D. Thompson

L. D. G.

ART. VII.—BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

IN verse 29 of the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians the apostle Paul, descending from the height of his argument in the five preceding verses, in which digression he had compassed with nervous thought the final cause of Christ's resurrection, turns directly to his opponents and addresses them with an *argumentum ad hominem* in the following words: 'Επεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν—"Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptized for them?" (Rev. Ver.)

The question which has been propounded again and again is: What did the apostle mean? As we all know, numerous theories have been submitted, but somehow they all seem to be either false to history or foreign to the logic of the apostle in this great chapter. Dr. Adam Clarke considered this verse to be the most difficult verse in the entire New Testament, and no one, we presume, will feel disposed to question this judgment who has ever attempted a solution of the passage, or in his researches has looked into the long list of opposing exegetes in Pool's *Synopsis*, or in other works, as Wolfe's or De Wette's or Meyer's Commentaries. That it is difficult, the number of different interpretations is sufficient evidence. The present attempt to elucidate the apostle's meaning, then, is not made in total ignorance of the peculiar difficulties to be overcome, nor of the failures of many learned and ingenious critics. It is not at all improbable, however, that greater difficulties have been forced by these very critics into the passage than can be found in the bare text itself.

Some interpreters (Adam Clarke, Rosenmüller, and Robinson among others) explain the verse by taking βαπτιζόμενοι in a metaphorical sense, signifying "immersed in sufferings," "overwhelmed in calamities," "a baptism of blood," etc. But (1) there is no term here denoting suffering, although Dr. Clarke says that "βαπτίζεσθαι, to be baptized, was used to express *being put to a violent death*," and quotes in proof several instances of its use in that sense. That βαπτίζεσθαι, with indirect allusion to the sacred rite of baptism, as Robinson says

(*N. T. Lex., sub voc.*), may have that signification (Matt. xx, 22, 23, Mark x, 38, 39) is well understood, but none of the passages quoted by the famous exegete are parallel to this passage, nor are any of them suggestive of a similar meaning. Dr. J. F. von Flatt (*Briefe Pauli an die Corinthier*), after stating that βαπτίζεσθαι may have the figurative signification "to suffer," "to be immersed in suffering," also refers to Mark x, 39, Luke xii, 50, and also quotes from Josephus *de Bello Jud.*, l. iv, c. 3, § 3, the words ἐβαπτισαν τὴν πόλιν. But the being baptized with a baptism, or the baptizing of a city, are altogether different ideas from being *baptized for a thing*.

2. The references to the figurative use of βαπτίζεσθαι in the above passages are made on the assumption that the apostle himself, in this passage, uses the term in that sense. But that he does so is the thing to be proved; it is the very question at issue. It is a canon of correct interpretation that a figurative signification is not to be attached to words the literal rendering of which makes good sense. Now, if we apply this rule to the passage in question we will see that there is no good reason why we should suppose that the apostle employed figurative language. If we do so interpret him we make him unnecessarily tautological, for in the very next verse (verse 30) he asks, "And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" The "we" does not indicate a distinction between the apostles and their helpers and the laity in the Church, nor between those of long standing in the Church and the οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι, those just coming in, for the new believers are in as much danger as the old members; nor does it refer to the apostle himself, for he afterward speaks of his own danger in verses 31, 32. The "we" includes the entire Church of Christ, the whole body of believers. Now, it is not at all probable that the apostle would say the same thing twice over in such immediate connection. On the contrary, the form of the question, "And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" shows clearly that the idea of suffering or calamity is an entirely new element in the argument, and not one that has been used heretofore. "What shall they do who are being baptized for the dead?" and "Why do we stand in jeopardy every hour?" are the two arguments contained in verses 28, 30. That they are two and not one, and that they are not identical, seems clear enough.

3. Then, again, there is no reason to suppose that the apostle did not refer literally to the Christian rite of baptism. The burden of the apostolic preaching was Jesus and the resurrection, and when men believed in the word which was spoken to them they were baptized into that faith. Hence the apostle could point to baptism, and as included therein the confession of faith, and most pertinently ask his opponents to define for him the significance or the value of baptism *if there was no resurrection of the dead*.

Other interpreters (as Alford, Hodge, Meyer) infer from the passage an allusion to a supposed fact that Christians sometimes presented themselves for baptism in behalf of believers who had died unbaptized. Thus Meyer:

It must have been something not wholly unusual in the apostolic Church, familiarity with which on the part of the readers is here taken for granted, that persons had themselves baptized once more for the benefit (*ὑπέρ*) of people who had died *unbaptized* but *already believing*, in the persuasion that this would be counted to them as their own baptism.*

De Wette is of the same opinion, and renders *ὑπέρ τῶν νεκρῶν* by *für die (anstatt der) Todten, instead of the dead*. Olshausen also renders in like manner. For this view it would be difficult to find either well-grounded philological or historical proofs, or any proofs that, tested by the Scriptures, will be conclusive. It is altogether arbitrary, we think, to take for granted that the apostle wrote *ὑπέρ* for *ἀντί*. In all his writings Paul employs *ἀντί* only seven times; but, after making all possible allowances for diversity of opinion, we number over seventy instances in which *ὑπέρ* occurs in its regular sense. In Philem. 13 *ὑπέρ* is used for *ἀντί*—*ἵνα ὑπέρ σοῦ μοι διακονῇ*, *that he might minister to me for thee*; but this use of *hyper* is rare, its usual significance being *for the sake of* rather than *instead of*. There is no historical ground for the view adopted by Meyer and De Wette and Olshausen and many others. That such a superstition as vicarious baptism was practiced by some heretical sects at the close of the first century is no proof that it was derived by them from apostolic times, as is supposed by the above exegetes, who rely mainly upon two passages in Tertullian for this proof.

* Com., in loc.

But inasmuch as "some are baptized for the dead," we will see whether there be good reason for this. Now, it is certain that they adopted this [practice] with such a presumption as made them suppose that the vicarious baptism [in question] would be beneficial to the flesh of another in anticipation of the resurrection; for unless it were a bodily [resurrection] there would be no pledge secured by this process of a corporeal baptism.*

Again, in his work *Anti-Marcion*, quoting the apostle in 1 Cor. xv, 29, he says:

"What," asks he, "shall they do who are baptized for the dead if the dead rise not?" Now never mind that practice [whatever it may have been]. The Februanian lustrations will perhaps answer him [quite as well] by praying for the dead. Do not then suppose that the apostle here indicates some new [god as the] author and advocate of [this baptism for the dead. His only aim in alluding to it was] that he might all the more fiercely insist upon the resurrection of the body, in proportion as they who were vainly baptized for the dead resorted to the practice from their belief of [such] a resurrection.

These are the passages to which commentators refer. But, as Neander says, † "Tertullian has been erroneously cited." Tertullian does not know any thing more of the real existence of a sect in the apostle's day practicing baptism for the dead than those who quote him. Nor does he say that such a custom was in vogue at that time; he merely argues on what Paul wrote in 1 Cor. xv, 29; and in his work *Against Marcion* he only refers to the same purpose, not mentioning any knowledge which he himself might have had that such a rite was ever practiced. His reference to the Kalendæ Februariæ, or the Lupercalia is of no importance, except as it may be used to confuse the subject.

In addition to this historical difficulty it seems very improbable, to say the least, taking the doctrinal characteristics of the apostle into consideration, that he would dignify or even recognize such an absurd anti-Christian practice, even as an illustration, without some word of disapproval.‡ That he ever did condemn the "senseless custom," granting its existence, we

* *De Res. Car. (Ante. Nic. Lib.)*

† *Planting and Training*, p. 163.

‡ "Es ist eine *argumentum ad hominem*, ein Berufung auf den herrschenden Glauben; wobei nur das Schwierigkeit macht, das den Ap. diessen widersinigen, Gebrauch gebilgt. Zu haben scheint, dass er ihn wenigstens nicht tadelt"—*De Wette, Kurze Erklärung den Briefe an die Cor.*

have not a shadow of evidence, although Meyer is confident that he did. He says:

For to assume with Baumgarten-Crusius (*Dogmengesch.*, ii, p. 313) that he himself had never at all disapproved of the βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, or to place with Rückert the vicarious baptism in the same line with the vicarious death of Christ, is to stand in the very teeth of the fundamental doctrine of the Pauline gospel—that of faith as the subjective ethical *causa mediana* of salvation.

But it is in this position that the defenders of the vicarious baptism theory stand, because there is no evidence of Paul's condemnation of the practice; and instead of its being an assumption to say that he did not condemn the practice, it is, in absence of any evidence to the contrary, an arbitrary assumption to say that he did. Finally, Dr. Whedon, after stating that "There is no reason to believe, *outside of the passage itself*, that any such practice existed in the apostolic Church," goes on to show in his own clear way that a "sudden and transient interpolation of heretical performers of a superstitious rite" is not only incredible, but totally destructive to the apostle's argument, as it certainly would be if his opponents would think it wise to make a reply. Another theory is, that the apostle alluded to a practice of administering the rite of baptism to candidates over the graves of the dead. Luther translated ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν by *über den Todten*, supposing doubtless that some such allusion had been made. But "*ὑπὲρ in örtlicher Bedeutung kommt im N. T. nicht vor*," says De Wette, who so understands Luther's translation; and Meyer, with numbers of others, observes that "super with the genitive in the local sense of *over* is foreign to the New Testament."

This theory also is wanting in historical support. There is nothing in the *Didache* suggestive of such a custom, nor do we find any thing in Clement, the supposed contemporary of the author or authors of the "Teaching." Eusebius, indeed,* who is often referred to in this case, quoting from an encyclical letter to the Church at Smyrna, concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp, writes:

Thus, at last taking up his bones, more valuable than precious stones, and more tried than gold, he deposited them where it

* *Hist.*, iv, 15.

was proper they should be. Then also, as far as we can, the Lord will grant us to collect and celebrate the natal day of his martyrdom in joy and gladness, both in commemoration of those who finished their contest before, and to exercise and prepare those that shall come after.

This is the only historical reference quoted in favor of the notion that while the apostles were yet alive Christians were sometimes baptized over the graves of the martyrs. If such was the case there certainly would be something dramatic both in the mode of the baptism and in the force of the words, "*Why are they then baptized over the dead?*" But the cold fact is, Eusebius is not speaking of baptism at all. Building churches or shrines over the graves of the martyrs and baptizing believers over these graves are altogether different matters. Both are post-apostolic, if the latter ever actually occurred.

The meaning of the apostle in this obscure text may be apprehended, we think, by the following paraphrase of the argument. We begin at verse 12:

But if Christ is preached as having been raised from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? Now, if there is no resurrection of the dead, then not even has Christ been raised. But if Christ is not risen our preaching is void, and so also is your faith. Besides this we are found false witnesses against God, because we have testified concerning him that he raised up Christ, whom he did not raise up if it is true that the dead are not raised. For necessarily, if the dead are not raised, then Christ, who died and was buried, has not been raised. Further, if Christ has not been raised your faith is deceptive, you are yet in your sins; then those also who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished, (*for the Christ they believed in is a dead Christ, if the dead rise not,*) and if in this life we have hope in Christ only, (and he being now, according to your reasoning, a dead Christ,) then we are of all men the most pitiable. But now Christ has been raised from the dead, the first-fruits of those having fallen asleep. . . . If this is not so, what shall they do who are being baptized with reference to the dead? If, to sum up the whole matter, the dead are not raised why are they (living believers) then baptized for the (hope of the) dead? Of what possible significance to them can baptism be? And further, why are *we* in peril all the time? I solemnly declare to you, brethren, by that glorying which I have of you in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily. If, as men do, I fought in the arena at Ephesus, of what good is it to me? If the dead rise not let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.

Such appears to be the argument of the apostle. Some in the Corinthian Church had affirmed in a general way that there was no resurrection of the dead. The apostle saw at once that a denial of the resurrection of the dead necessarily involved a denial of Christ's resurrection, and so he proceeds to show the absurdity of their faith in a dead Christ, and in the preaching of men who had falsely attributed an extraordinary act to God which he did not do. From this he goes on to show in the most logical manner that expectation of salvation in such a false gospel was wretchedly absurd, and that, according to their premise, all who had died professing faith in a risen Redeemer had been the victims of a cruel delusion—that instead of obtaining everlasting life they had really perished. And so he says, here bringing his argument straight home to the reason of his opponents, If all have perished who have died in this faith why do you baptize for them? Why baptize at all? Of what possible significance as to the future can this rite or any rite of Christianity be? For, if your denial is correct, in what does Christianity excel heathenism or Judaism? If in this life we have hope in Christ only as our Redeemer, *and he is dead*, then, because of what we have to endure for the sake of this delusion, and from the fact that we know the worthlessness of all other religions, thus being left without any hope, we are of all men the most miserable. But Christ *is not dead*; he is risen, and baptism in his name and in his Gospel is not a baptism for the *dead*, but a baptism for the *living*.

This we think is the meaning of the apostle. It involves none of the philological and historical difficulties of the far-fetched theories we have noticed, and that it may be sustained by the closest examination of the original we will now endeavor to show.

Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν. With the causal conjunction *επεὶ* the apostle resumes the line of thought which he had dropped at verse 23, or at verse 18, and not at verse 20, or 16, as some have it, and *ἐπεὶ τί ποιή.* may be rendered, "Since if this [what he dropped at verse 23] is not the case, what shall they do," etc. So Bloomfield, who says, "At *ἐπεὶ* there is an ellipsis of *ἄλλως*, since [otherwise, that is, if that were not the case, that is, if there were no resurrection]." The Vulgate reads, *Alioquin quid faciunt*, etc., but *quoniam* is perhaps a better equivalent of the causal sense of *επεὶ* than *alioquin*.

Ποιήσουσιν. Ποιέν is not to be understood here in its primary sense, but in its secondary meaning of "*To do*, rather with the notion of a continued than of a completed action, and so . . . like πράσσειν."—*Liddell and Scott*. The intransitive signification of πράσσειν is, "*To be in a certain state or condition, to face so and so.*" Eph. vi, 21. The idea of the apostle is not what those being baptized shall do (make, accomplish, produce, or act), but what mental or spiritual condition will they find themselves in in relation to Christian baptism, and as involved therein, to Christian truth, if there is no resurrection of the dead. If the dead rise not, baptism has no significance; faith in Christ is worthless. How can you extricate yourselves from the terrible dilemma which inevitably results from a denial of the resurrection?

ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν. The force of the preposition here is one of the disputed points, since upon its signification the whole question may be said to turn. We have shown that it does not have the sense of *over*, and also that it cannot be taken for *ἀντί*. The usual signification of ὑπὲρ with the genitive is, "In behalf of, with reference to, for the sake of," Rom. xv, 8; 2 Cor. xii, 19; Acts v, 41; 1 Cor. xv, 3; 2 Cor. viii, 23; 2 Thess. ii, 1; ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου, *with respect to the coming of the Lord*. And the meaning of ὑπὲρ here is, we think, "concerning," "with reference to," "with respect to." What shall they do who are being baptized with reference to, or respect to, the dead? that is, to the hope or the fact of their resurrection, as in nearly all the above references. For instance, Rom. xv, 8, ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ, *in behalf of, or for the sake of, the truth of God*, that is, *to confirm his promises*; Acts v, 41, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος, *on account of the Name, or in behalf of the Name*, that is, "to glorify it;" and so of the rest of the passages.

Τῶν νεκρῶν. There is no reason why this should be taken in a figurative sense. It is used literally throughout the chapter, and should be so understood here. In this Greek plural with the article we have strong proof of the correctness of our view. The article is generic, so that νεκρῶν is not of particular individuals, but of all the dead, and that includes *the Lord Jesus*, since if the dead rise not, and that is assumed, *he* is not risen. Paul will not admit an exception in the case of Jesus, whether his opposers have been willing to do so or not.

They have affirmed that the dead rise not, and to that postulate with inexorable rigor the keen logician holds them; nor will he by any concession make a way for them to escape from its consequences. Meyer says: "Christ cannot be designated as νεκρός. But the fact that *he is a dead Christ* if the dead rise not is the very core of the apostle's argument, and it is to that crushing conclusion that he unrelentingly holds his opponents.

Εἰ ὅλως, κ.τ.λ. "If in one word," "if, to sum up;" Meyer renders, "if universally." The Vulgate reads "*si omnino*," etc., which is much better than either of our versions, the Authorized or the Revised. The adverb ὅλως is not displaced, and it has an exact equivalent in *omnino*. The sense of the passage is, "*If, in a word*," or, "*If, to sum up all that has been said*, the dead rise not, then," etc.

In our examination of this difficult passage of Holy Scripture we have shown: 1. That βαπτίζουσιν is to be taken in a literal and not in a metaphorical sense. 2. That ἐπὶ is not to be taken for ἀντί, but in its usual signification, with the genitive of "*in behalf of*," "*with reference or respect to*." 3. That τῶν νεκρῶν is to be understood literally and not figuratively, and that it includes the Lord Jesus according to the logical deductions of the apostle from the major premise of his opponents. Our understanding, then, of the whole matter is this: The converts of the apostles were baptized into the belief in Christ Jesus and the resurrection. For them afterward to deny the fundamental fact of the resurrection was to deny all that they had professed in baptism, and to destroy all hopes of redemption in Christ Jesus. Hence the apostle appeals to the meaning of Christian baptism, which is being administered, and closes the controversy by showing that the baptism which they received and which others were receiving is in no sense a baptism for the dead, but a baptism for the LIVING, since Christ is not dead but is risen, and hath sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high: "and as by Adam all die, so by Christ will all be restored to life, each one in his own rank, Christ a first-fruit, afterward those who are Christ's at his APPEARING."

R. J. Cooke.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

♦♦♦
OPINION.

WHILE the Old Testament is plethoric in Messianic hints, which Rabbi Hillel declared to be fulfilled in Hezekiah, but whom Rav Joseph contradicted by a quotation from Zechariah, it is unwise to claim that every historical event recorded in its pages is of typical significance, and that every statement or truth that can be interpreted in favor of the Christian view should be so construed, though it may be evident that such use of it was not in the mind of the author, and not even remotely in the mind of God. In their eagerness to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah by establishing his Davidic lineage, commentators have urged an exegetical construction of many passages and chapters that is contrary to the historical spirit, the geographical setting, the inductive meaning, and the prophetic sense of the same. As the transparent references to the divine Comer are numerous enough for the purpose, the resort to forced interpretations and many-sided inferences excite a suspicion of the direct evidences offered, and alienate those whom it is proposed to reclaim to the truth. The Levitical system of sacrifices, the Christological elements in the Psalms, the pure Messiahism in Isaiah, Daniel, Haggai, Joel, Micah, and Malachi, and the whole outlook of the Old Testament period, unite in affirming an unanswerable fulfillment in the Son of Mary. To go outside of these in search of absolute foreshadowings is to travel into uncertainty, and to assert that other writers are equally Messianic is to mislead the inquirer after truth and jeopardize the faith already secured. Neither Zephaniah, Nahum, Amos, Hosea, Esther, nor Ezra should be tortured into teachers of New Testament Messiahism, tracings of which in their writings are exceedingly obscure, if they are to be found at all; and to base the Christian doctrine upon them is to invite attack, if not defeat. The inferences that the shrewd exegete draws from the dark sayings and obscure teachings in behalf of the doctrine can only be conjectural, which in a matter of such transcendent import is more of a mockery than an assurance. Confine the Messianic prophecies to those that are clearly outspoken, that chagrined the Talmudists and startle the Jews of to-day when they study them, that Christ and the apostles quoted as bearing upon the subject, and that the average mind will detect equally with the scholar, and faith in them will be established, and Israel will be won to the worship of Him whom, unknown as the Prince of Glory, they with ruthless hands destroyed.

Exegesis: Hebrews xii, 16, 17: "Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Eeau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing

[from Isaac], he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance [not in himself, for Esau did repent, but in Isaac], though he sought it carefully with tears." Esau's tearful repentance did not change the decree of rejection of the unchangeable Isaac, and he therefore lost both birthright and primal blessing. So in the great day to come the sinner's plea for a reversal of divine judgment will not avail, the woe of eternal perdition abiding with him forever. This is the death-stroke of the doctrine of *post-mortem* probation. Bishop J. N. FitzGerald has discovered in this vein the argument that silences the Andover speculatists.

The amenability of heathen converts to the rules and refinements of Christian civilization cannot be strongly urged in communities where such civilization does not exist. Time must be allowed for the cultivation and observance of the minor morals; and then we must subtract from our demand of conformity to our standards all social habits and customs that, harmless in themselves and different from ours, are the outgrowth of climate, religion, family laws, and that native spirit which is ineradicable. When, however, a distinctive ethical habit or condition, or a religious belief or truth, is in the scale, the balance of weight must be given in favor of a true ethics and of the true religion. Hence a polygamist in pagan lands should be required to forsake his polygamous relations before he should enter into full fellowship with the Church. If the heathen is a criminal, or a violator of divine law in any form, or to any degree, though upheld in such violation by native feeling or legislation, the prerequisite to honorable standing in the Church should be a removal of the impediment and a disavowal of all sin. This is necessary to the moral discipline of the people, and to an exhibition of what the Gospel teaches, and what it can do in hearts defiled by sin. The conditions of salvation are the same every-where, and while it may be difficult to enforce them in some pagan countries it should be done, or the Gospel will be of none effect. The recommendation of the Lambeth encyclical letter, that heathen polygamists espousing the religion of Christ should not be admitted to baptism until they will accept the law of Christ, is timely and wise. The enforcement of it means a strike at the foundations of polygamous heathendom; and if the Gospel is to have free course throughout the world it must strike down all abominations and lift up the ensign of purity before the nations.

That the theater flourishes in America is no proof that the dramatic art is improving, or that there is any demand for its purification. The claim that the modern actor is above impeachment, and that the moral tone of the stage is superior to what it was one hundred years ago, is not sustained by the testimony of theatrical critics or observers of the influence of the drama. Mr. Clement Scott, for twenty-five years a London dramatic editor, pronounces the stage as unsafe for pure women and as the source of ruinous temptations to actors, managers, and people, as much now as ever. On the other hand, Mr. Irving, too enthusiastic to be reliable, exonerates

the stage from corruption and pronounces the drama the greatest moral reformer of the age. The combined influence of poetry, music, and painting does not, in his biased judgment, equal the educational and reformatory work of the theater; but to such a wide-sweeping statement even the conservative English press dissents. That the age needs a vitalizer goes without sending; but that the drama is the remedy for its barbarism is an item of news. It may be that the school and the Church are not as aggressive against the immoralities as their commission requires; but we are not ready to believe that Edwin Booth, E. H. Sothorn, Lawrence Barrett, Miss Fanny Davenport, Miss Rose Coghlan, and Mme. Modjeska, or Mr. Irving, with all his better adjuncts, can refine society and eliminate its evil tendency. It is not by comedy or tragedy, by such plays as "Fritz in a Mad-House," "A Brass Monkey," "A Sad Coquette," "Under the Gaslight," "A Legal Wreck," or "La Dame aux Camellias," that either players or audience will be advanced in self-respect or be nourished with an aspiration for the good and the true. The sensuous and sensual are in combination in nearly every play, and but deepen the intensity of the physical life, the intellectual and the moral being unaffected except as they are silenced into insensibility of noble passion and high achievement. Mr. Irving is an idealist, and the drama is a phantom of idealism.

In suggesting a new, or revised, Methodist Catechism, we echo the sentiment of many who are familiar with the defects and the working value of the old and unused book of questions and answers relating to the history, doctrines, and usages of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It is not enough to say that, like the Westminster Catechism, ours should stand as a monument of unchangeable Wesleyan theology, to be handed down to the generations; for whatever excellence or demerit the Calvinistic book may have, we cannot claim an approach to perfection for ours, either in the questions or answers; and a revision is imperative if it shall exert any well-defined educational influence on the youthful mind of the Church. Such questions as "Who made you?" "Was the body of man created mortal?" "Was man created good?" and such statements as the Holy Ghost "framed the human nature of Christ," and "All mankind being born in sin are by nature under the wrath of God," are misleading in meaning, or too metaphysical in form, or too inelegantly couched, or too theologically inaccurate and harmful. No revision has occurred since 1852. Practically, the Catechism has fallen into "innocuous desuetude," a state somewhat alarming if catechetical instruction be considered a desideratum. In some churches and schools the *Light to the Path*, by Dr. Joseph Longking, a compend of Bible teaching concerning God and the creation, fall, and restoration, and in others, *Studies in Christian Doctrine*, by the Rev. George A. Hubbell, have superseded the almost functionless Catechism. A few extracts from it in the *Sunday-School Journal* will not save it from final oblivion. It is true that only by an act of the General Conference can a revision be authorized; but in the meantime certain

pedagogues might be at work with something to propose four years hence which will relieve the Church of an anxiety it ought not to bear, and our standard Catechism of a ban entirely unnecessary and injurious.

Great authors usually acquire their reputation from one of many books that they write. Mrs. H. B. Stowe, the writer of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, added nothing to her fame by subsequent works; Sir Walter Scott never excelled *Ivanhoe*; Francis Bacon surpassed himself in *Novum Organum*; Plato reached the highest water-mark in the *Republic*; Victor Hugo crystallized in *Les Misérables*; Shakespeare's maximum is *King Lear*; Darwin's *Descent of Man* is his greatest work; Daniel Webster's peerless argument was that in the Stephen Girard will case; Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*, the earliest, was his profoundest, book; Dean Stanley is at the top in *History of the Jewish Church*; Taine in *English Literature*; Janet in *Final Causes*; Bushnell in *The Vicarious Sacrifice*; Macaulay in his *History of England*; Owen Meredith in *Lucille*; General Lew Wallace in *Ben-Hur*, and Swedenborg in *True Christian Religion*. The inspired penmen are under the rule of limitation. Genesis is the preferred book of Moses; Isaiah's prophecies are superior to his biographies; the Epistle to the Romans is the masterpiece of Paul; John eclipses himself in his gospel; and the Sermon on the Mount is esteemed the richest and completest of the Master's ethical and religious accents. Why is this? Certainly not because of exhausted ability, or disuse of power, or lethargy of effort, for mind enlarges by achievement. If the explanation lies not in non-fecundity of mind, or fixed horizon of subject, or the hedge of the world, it must be found in a law of compensation that permits but the single enduring success to one life. Yet the last hypothesis is cloudy with pessimism.

The arraignment of the respective books of the Old Testament, in particular by Rationalists, has developed a surprising amount of scholarship both in the attack and the defense. In addition to their rejection of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, it is held by many critics that nearly all the so-called books are incomplete and fragmentary, and therefore unreliable except in general teaching. Eichhorn pronounces Haggai a fragment; Knobel believes that portions of the original of Micah were lost in the prophet's day; Bauer attributes the second part of Isaiah to a later editor; De Wette denies the authenticity of Daniel; Gesenius judges that Jonah was written before the exile, while Jahn postpones its composition to a post-exilic period; Job was written by Moses or Hezekiah; Ezra was made up by several prophets; Obadiah borrowed from Jeremiah, or Jeremiah from Obadiah; and the Book of Jasher (Josh. x. 13), supposed to contain an accurate chronicle of Jewish history, perished perhaps long before the canon closed. To some of the allegations there is a plausibility that is fascinating, as the fragmentary character of some of the documents; but this is not fatal to the teaching or design of the document. The four gospels are without doubt the fragments of com-

plete biographies, written or unwritten, but this makes not against their authenticity, genuineness, or credibility. The Bible is to be judged, not by what it omits, but by what it contains; and, if it contain all needed truth, it is little matter in what form the truth appears, or whether its vehicle is old, broken, without polish, and insufficient for the strain of criticism, or beautiful, strong, radiant, and perfect. It is confessed that the Masoretic text from which the Old Testament has been translated is imperfect, and in the light of modern scholarship an improved interpretation is possible; but a new translation of the Hebrew, a re-arrangement of the order of the books, and an assignment to them of proper authorship so far as is known, as has been recently done by Professor Graetz, of Breslau, while necessary to overcome the cynicism of the Rationalist, will not result in the modification of any doctrine, the announcement of any new truth, the confirmation of any historic incident, or in the more than possible illumination of some obscurity upon which neither faith nor knowledge rests. The Rationalist has attacked but the form of truth; the truth remains.

The reader cannot fail to observe the addition of another department to the *Review*, which we have been assured in advance is a great desideratum. "The Arena" affords space for brief scholarly discussion and criticism of live subjects by live men, or is a supplement of the larger department of contributions. He who can say something within the limit of two hundred words to the edification of the Church is invited to forward the mental product, subject to our rules for the admission of articles. The *fac-simile* signature of writers of published articles is also a noteworthy though minor feature, for the first time introduced into the *Review*. Other changes in arrangement will be recognized without mention. Our purpose is to provide a symposium for nearly every issue which will be adapted to all classes of readers. This is new to the *Review*. As the January number contains all the departmental and other changes contemplated by the editor he sends it forth with the hope that as it is considered by its patrons, both ministers and laymen, they will be able to approve its supervision and enjoy its contents. In general, the outside denominational press of the country have extended us a fraternal hand, unless we except a few "crude" and "big-worded" Calvinists, who should not complain of our attitude toward them, since, according to their supralapsarianism and other obsolete dogmas, we were foreordained from all eternity to say that we never had any faith in their doctrinal abominations. We are irenic in spirit, but we propose to defend the truth. With this in view, Arminian Protestantism is in accord with us, and beyond this we have no concern.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.

THE MISSIONARY MOVEMENT EDUCATIONAL.

THE net result of the missionary movement is usually expressed from year to year by the amount of money raised in its behalf, the number of conversions reported in foreign countries, and the maintenance of that general *esprit de corps* that, as a consequence, seems to animate the Church engaged in its prosecution. Along with an annual report is the noticeable tendency to shout when the statistics satisfy or exceed expectations, and to repine and confess a reactionary mood when they reveal a deficiency and imply a burdensome debt on the Missionary Society. This is the tangible or external aspect of the movement, which addresses itself to the average mind with some degree of interest, and which has great prominence in addresses, sermons, and every effort intended to excite enthusiasm, increase subscriptions, and meet apportionments, as the best means of accomplishing the end. Of this method criticism would be cruel in spirit and enervating in effect, for it is vital to success. History derives its importance somewhat from its catalogue of woes, dates, revolutions, reformatations, the personal instruments and the producing agencies of its progress. All movements, when completed, may be reduced to statistics and the almanac; but the question is, are not causes and effects of more value than figures and finances? Human conditions, heathenism rife, barbarisms protruding into religions, ignorances fencing the race, crimes uprooting established order, infirmities honeycombing the refinements of civilization, and sins sinking mankind toward perdition, cannot well be tabulated, but the history of the race's slow evolution into progress is, as Mrs. Browning says,

"Coherent with statistical despairs."

Recently the "statistical despairs" have rung in our ears as the exact number of millions of our race to be rescued have been given, and the exact but insufficient means for their redemption have been laid before us.

In our study of the missionary movement it occurs to us that the gross result has not been announced, and that several invisible and yet potent, because permanent, achievements have been omitted. The movement owes much to the educational forces behind it, to the patient instruction of faithful ministers concerning its necessity, and to the spiritual sense of responsibility awakened in the Church by the enthusiasm of those who have been intrusted with its supervision; but holding up the movement rather as a cause than an effect, it has by its reflex influence educated the Church in the spirit of the movement itself, with all its underlying significance and relationship to the world. Instead, then, of considering the educational forces at work for the success of the movement, of which too much cannot be said, it is proper to study the movement

as educational in effect upon the life of the Church, which will open to us, not a realm of statistics, or of alternating successes and reverses based upon them, but a realm of quiet, leavening influence, without which the movement itself must finally cease to attract, or have power to command the support of the Church upon which it depends.

From the first, but in particular recently, the movement has reacted on the Church in educating it in Christ's conception of a spiritual kingdom, and its adaptation to this world. Such a kingdom, long ago foretold as coming; in spirit removed from the natural, yet so adjusted to human conditions as, when incorporated with them, to refine them and exercise a pleasing dominance over them; a kingdom to the outside observer antagonistic to the world's order, but to the inside member sweetly in harmony with it; a kingdom with death to sin as its aim and the divine Son as the enthroned ruler; a kingdom of truth, righteousness, and peace, with the Holy Ghost as the unseen agent of its progress; a kingdom with the wind in the wings of its messengers, eyes in the wheels of their chariots, and for its guard and commander One with bow in hand sitting on the white horse of the Apocalypse, going forth to conquer; such a kingdom is the Lord's, a knowledge of whose glory shall fill the earth as the waters cover the sea. Along this line of thinking the Church has been guided, as its impulses to do something for the establishment of the divine rulership have evolved into the duties of sacrifice and heroic service for others. And this is necessary. It must grow up into the great thought of God, and open wide its arms to receive the descending plan before it will permanently co-operate with it. The divine thought, too high to be measured, too wide to be stated, eternal enough for angelic inquiry, is becoming a human thought, no longer foreign to us, but our own conception of the world and a life-fusing influence upon our activities and powers.

A study of the kingdom is inseparable from a glance at the outlook, hidden in the perspective of revelation. Turning toward the future, the prophets are summoned into our presence with their scrolls, on which are written the destiny of nations, the great battle of Armageddon, the dawn of a millennium, and the sway of redemption until the sun expires and the heavens are no more. Malachi says, that "from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles;" an assurance that means triumph over the powers of evil and darkness. Perhaps the consummation is distant from this generation, but the sympathetic mind cannot but be absorbed with the final phase of things, and must be enlarged in its perceiving and comprehending faculties as it stretches toward the days of a covenant fulfilled in a world's redemption. It may be that ours is not the chief period of unfulfilled prophecy; but such a period is one of the certainties of the future, as the sequel of the great epic of redemption and as the final and greatest epoch of history, thrilling in its progress and marvelous as the end of the divine struggle. To be drawn into fellowship with the divine programme, and to know that we are coadjutors in its execution, has an inspiring and elevating effect upon a mind with affinities for things spiritual and eternal.

Refined, scriptural, enlarging, as is this process of thought, it is in closest sympathy with that more practical education that inspires the Church to immediate response to its duty, and is the foundation of the highest form of activity. The function of the Church is twofold: it has a duty to itself—a duty of discipline and development of its inner life; and a duty to the world—to enlighten it concerning the will of God, the provisions of salvation, and the necessity of repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. It is not enough that it comprehend the nature of the kingdom of God and absorb its spirit into its own life; it must propagate it until the world is transformed into its beauty and likeness. It is not enough that it believe the prophets, for abstract faith may be powerless; it must concrete its faith in wholesome endeavor to fulfill it. Hence the organization of missionary societies as the expression of the knowledge and faith of the Church in the divine arrangement for the moral elevation of the world. Hence talent, money, genius, labor, and enthusiasm must be consecrated to the great purpose if it be accomplished. Hence methods, expedients, now this plan then that plan, if an advance against Satan is made; hence machinery of all kinds and men of all types working with zeal, devising liberal things, only so that they are in harmony with the immanent thought of God and in unity among themselves, that God's great arrangement may be finally an accomplished fact. In this every-day, systematic working of the idea, and in its value as a sovereign truth, the Church is being educated rapidly, efficiently; some disinclined to the process, but others enlarged by it, and all catching the notes of that music that, sung in heaven, will one day fill earth's atmosphere with its melody and gladness.

Perhaps our deficient religious education is more manifest in the exhibition of the intensive and causative motives that govern in Christian benevolence than in any other department of the Christian life. Happily, the missionary movement itself, propelled too frequently by the lower class of motives, is correcting the general error and amplifying duty based upon a knowledge of the truth that prompts it. It is natural that one not schooled in higher truth should be influenced by what he sees and hears; and that outward, or selfish, or temporary motives should govern him in doing when a knowledge of the true reason of conduct would be an inspiration to higher living and acting. Such motives as denominational pride, the printing of the donor's name in the Conference minutes, the gift of a missionary certificate, the rivalry among Conference pastors for pre-eminence, and stratagems employed to procure funds, may result in temporary success; but, if not discreditable, they are the symptoms of a deplorable ignorance of the highest factors in intelligent and religious doing, and should be supplanted by gospel principles, a knowledge of which is sufficient to lead to ordinary benevolence and all necessary sacrifice, even martyrdom itself. The returns of the latest missionary year of the Methodist Episcopal Church indicate an appalling deficiency in the sums given by the people for missionary purposes; a state of things that some interpret as a reaction in the Church touching the cause of

redemption; others as a reaction touching the methods pursued generally for raising funds; but to us it is a significant proof of a deficient religious education, that can only be overcome by an abandonment of lower methods and a wise discipline under the tutelage of the Gospel. It should be stated that the missionary secretaries, who have observed the spasmodic tendencies of the Church and the reign of the forbidden principles, are in accord with the suggestions of higher teaching and a more thorough grounding of the Church on the truth of God. All along they have been distributing missionary intelligence, creating through Chaplain McCabe a missionary literature, and preaching the Gospel as the word of truth, to the end that the Church might not die while in the throes of a wonderful emotion.

In its direct form the educational process has stimulated the benevolent spirit of the Church, as seen in the hitherto larger giving, not only to the pre-eminent cause of missions, but also to all adjunctive and co-ordinate enterprises of the Church—as church extension and for the work among the freedmen. Is it too much to say that the missionary idea is the pulse of the benevolent spirit of the Church, and that in proportion as it supports the one it supports all, for are not all of the same spirit, though a diversity of manifestation? Never did the Church do so much for general or specific benevolence as when it was doing the most for missions, showing that the one spirit is the spirit of life, and the one cause the womb of causes.

But the reflex effect of the missionary movement is, if not so patent to all eyes, at least most triumphant to those who can see in it the moral culture, the true discipline, and the enlarged manhood and womanhood of the disciples of Christ. It were a sorry failure if it failed to produce a nobler type of representative Christians; if it did not, while widening one's intellectual command of the truth, broaden the character; if it did not, while developing God's kingdom, develop its subjects into kings and priests unto God; if it did not, while illuminating the horizon with streaks of the millennial day, pour a flood-tide of celestial light upon the eye-balls of those who hitherto could detect nothing beyond the localism or the chronology of their abode and hour. It is true to say, that with all its defects it does educate the disciple in higher knowledge; it does expand pent-up sympathies into forces and realities; it does follow blossoms of hope with fruits of righteousness; it does strengthen the habit of prayer; it does turn faith into an instrument of efficiency in the realm of endeavor. Uniting the soul to God, the disciple is prayerful, inquiring, studious, reverent in the presence of truth, a helpful assistant of the Most High; uniting man to man, the disciple is sympathetic, warm with tender emotion, sacrificial in spirit, philanthropic in purpose, benevolent in deed. The word *brother* he learns to apply to every man, for he has discovered that its smallest meaning is that which restricts it to kindred in the flesh, while its larger secret envelops the race. God is the Father, the race is the brother, the world is the kingdom, and Christ is the sovereign of hearts, as he is the worshiped of angels.

It is the religious education of Christ's people in these royal truths, and

their appropriation of the spirit of Christ, that now most interests us, and that is fundamental to the stability and prosperity of the Church. The missionary movement is an educator in this realm as no other single movement can be, and in our calculation of its results and recension of its history these less visible but more deeply imbedded consequences of its progress should be emphasized, both for their value and because they more than make up for the financial deficiency that has caused lamentation throughout our Zion. Impressing higher truth upon the Church, and training ourselves into harmony with God's ideas and God's plans, the gifts of the people will increase until the treasures of the Lord will be filled with the treasures of the hosts of God's elect people.

THE THEOLOGICAL TENSION.

It is a symptom of approaching soundness in theological belief that against the resistance of a hoary and cherished conservatism it is undergoing an analytic examination, with added tests of its character, tendency, value, and truthfulness corresponding to exact and accepted biblical teaching. Only partial results have, up to date, been proclaimed; but these, taken singly or together, justify the attempt to reconstruct the form of theology as it may have been found to be self-contradictory, or reduced to a theory of negations bordering on agnosticism, or framed in the interest of a sect, or based upon superficial acquaintance with the truth it professes to represent. The theological spirit is an inquiring, penetrating spirit, with a function as distinct and appropriate as the scientific or poetic spirit, and it should employ itself in the furtherance of an exactly literal embodiment of truth so far as human thought may be used to symbolize the cogitations of the divine mind. It is preposterous to allege that theology has attained a maximum expression, or that revealed truth has been unchangeably embalmed in any religious creed, or that extra effort at re-expression is useless if not impious. The fact is that modern theology, an acknowledged improvement over mediæval thought, is little more than truth in silhouette—the merest shadow of the essence of that which constitutes the concreted will of God.

In this arraignment of theological forms we carefully distinguish them from the biblical revelations, the beauty, majesty, strength, and divinity of which are yet to appear in some final and perfect human representation. Criticism of theology must not be interpreted as a criticism of the Bible, as artistic judgment of Murillo's "Magdalen" must not be confounded with a moral judgment of the model penitent herself.

Within recent years it has come to light that the moral world has been largely governed less by pure truth than by the badly built theologies of men, against which rebellions not a few, both in the Church and outside, have occurred, and which will be more frequent until theology accounts for itself at the bar of reason and the judgment-seat of truth. It requires little proof to establish that the Miltonic theology, saturated with

medieval conceptions and tinctured with the prevailing thought of the bard's own times, has suggested problems the Scriptures do not raise, and averred as divine teaching that which neither Moses nor the Master precipitated as truth. That animals became carnivorous because of Adam's transgression is scientifically repugnant, and without the support of any type of logic; yet Milton heralded it as an outcome of human sin, and some pulpits have echoed it as if it were based upon a divine warrant. We beg the theologian who sits at Milton's feet to arise and shake the dust from his brain, and find a teacher who is not a poet.

Our standing criticism, however, is of the theology of the Calvinistic type—that explained in any way at all, apologized for by its friends and modified by its advocates—has shackled human inquiry, paralyzed human activity, and weighted the world with desperation and a sense of dismal fear. To the logical results of the doctrine of predestination, as formulated by the Westminster theologians, the world righteously demurs, condemning the spirit that prompts its utterance, and the faith that has no other reason for clinging to it than that it is an inheritance.

The doctrine itself is a reflection on the divine administration, not to say a violation of the canons of reason in the interpretation of truth, for truth is harmonious with itself. But other teachings abound in antinomies which other theologies espouse, but for which there is no justification other than human ignorance or the imbecility of the human faculties. The thinker must admit that some difficulties grow out of the relations of foreknowledge and responsibility, sin and eternal retribution for it, atonement and salvation; but he need not despair over these and other correlated truths, or pronounce them, as did Dr. Leonard W. Bacon, absolutely insoluble. The scape-goat of our failure correctly and rationally to interpret truth is said to be its insolubility; but in that event on what ground may faith in it be predicated? The intelligent mind revolts at the requirement of a superstitious or unreasonable faith, or a faith grounded in theological *ipse dixitism*. If divine truth, as revealed, were unintelligible and beyond all power of human expression, a faith without a grain of wisdom in it, and dark as midnight, might be required; but truth is knowable, explainable, rational in essence and form, easily apprehended, and requires faith in itself because it is rational and in harmony with pure intellective processes under the guidance and illumination of the Holy Spirit. Bacon's maxim, *Sola spes est in vera inductione*, applies here as well as to its original object. It is not less faith in, but greater knowledge of, the truth that the human mind should acquire and maintain. In insisting upon this phase of the religious life we are not unmindful of the dangers it involves; but it is better to free ourselves from the old bondage of superstitious faith, and begin to inquire why we believe, as well as to be sure that we believe.

Just now the Andover theology—particularly the supplemental dogma that vouches a second probation after death for infants, idiots, and the heathen who have not heard the Gospel—is embarrassing some minds; but this is a swing of the pendulum from the inevitable logic of the stubborn

Calvinistic fathers, who could condemn infants and heathen to perdition with seeming pleasure, because in their limited judgment the truth favored such destiny. Out of this quagmire of false teaching the theologian will lift himself when he will *think of* the truth, not as his revolutionary mind has conceived it, but as it shall appear in essence to his real reason.

While truth is thus talked of, not as truth but as a problem, as contradicting itself, or as insoluble, the Rationalist comes forth to add confusion to the circle of thinkers by declaring that the sources of truth are unreliable, leaving the impression that truth itself is a lost force, whose trail only is seen in the alleged book of revelation. To theologians in general the Bible is the book of truth, a vantage-ground not to be surrendered; but the Rationalist disturbs faith, not in the truth, but in that which hitherto has been accepted as the record of moral ideas and of the highest attainable religious supernaturalism. He declares that Moses did not write the Pentateuch; Isaiah is not the author of more than one half the document that bears his name; Ezra edited a good portion of the sacred canon; and the prophets borrowed from one another, fitting their prophecies into harmony with one another; and he therefore demands a pause in our faith until these discrepancies that he raises are fully adjudicated. The Rationalist himself does not settle them; the believing theologian may not be able to do it; but he cannot ignore the attack thus made, which for the time compels silence on sect theologies and an absorbed interest in the rationalistic craze.

Not in all, but in some, of these struggles the Arminian thinker is interested, since whatever is truth concerns him; and as there is but one source of truth he, in common with all thinkers, is profoundly affected by the critical interrogations, demands, and modifications of Rationalism. As to sect theologies he may rest in peace, for the trend of theological thought is toward the best type of Arminianism; as to Rationalism, he must be alert to detect its sincerity or want of it; the results of its researches and the inferences founded upon them; the problematical aspect of its inquiries; and the fatal or final syllabus to which they lead. Granting that Arminianism is in no danger from any source, it must be confessed that some questions, aside from all denominational interest in them, need a larger elaboration and a more definite and systematic exposition than they have received to satisfy faith and reason. The doctrine of inspiration is burdened with too many theories, all of which but one should be expunged from faith; eschatology, unfolded in the Scriptures, is folded up in theology, and is preached with hesitations, uncertainties, and a crude and stammering jargon; theodicy is yet a conundrum, theologians solemnly playing with it and thinking themselves wise.

If we plead for greater theologians—thinkers who will hand us not platitudes, but truths—men who know as well as believe—messengers who dwell in light and drive away darkness—it is because of the dilemmas of the theologians, whose confusions imperil faith in the certainties of religion.

AMERICAN MORAL PROBLEMS.

It is seldom that political elections in this country determine the fate of moral issues, or settle any of the great problems in which the Christian element is devotedly interested. The immediate effect of the vote of the majority is felt in business circles, the halls of legislation, and the departments of government, while it justly energizes and directs the administration which it has elevated into authority. This limitation of effect is not because of the insincerity of the people, or their abandonment of higher ideas, but because of a partisan intensity that at the time seems necessary and is allowed to submerge all other interests, however vital, and at other times prominent in civil life. In one respect this political narrowness to one object is gratifying, since it proves that moral principles are not the subject of vote; they do not go up or down with majorities, but are inalienable in society, abiding in all ages. Parties are amenable to ethics; ethical principles are not amenable to parties, and in no sense within the grasp or under the dictation of the suffrages of men. The Decalogue is not the football of a caucus any more than the sun is the slave of artists. Independent of political action, because eternal in essence, moral principles may be interrupted and their influence for a time destroyed, or they may be assisted and extended in their authority by the decision of political parties. There are some problems that, *prima facie* ethical, are so related to political life as to imperil or improve it as parties foster and admit them into their legislation and standards of conduct. Of such are the Mormon question, the use of the Bible in the public schools, the hygienic value of the Sabbath, and all movements that forefend crime, licentiousness, ignorance, and general degradation.

It is, however, a strange fact, for which posterity will surely condemn this age, that political parties, whatever their private moral belief, are shy of distinct moral propositions when political triumphs are at stake, as if the former were incongruous at such a time, or inimical either to the methods pursued or the ends sought by the latter. Without undertaking to point out the philosophy of this disinclination to moral results on the part of political managers, we deem it worthy of record that, studiously ignored by them, the great ethical ideas are ever before the American people, who will finally awake to the importance of their appropriation and assimilation in life. Elections or not, success or defeat, ignored or played with in hypocrisy, the moral issues are supreme before the people; and neither rain, nor frost, nor epidemic, nor parties, nor oaths, nor sin, nor death can rob them of pre-eminence. Up they come as the survivors of all political maneuvering, rising with every morning's sun, and brisk all the day long in their demand for a hearing and a trial. They knock at our doors, shout in our ears, promise their blessings, and threaten their curses, as a welcome or refusal is extended to them. Hence, we were not a little surprised that in his article in a recent number of *Scribner's Magazine*, on "Problems in American Politics," the Hon. Hugh McCulloch should lay great stress upon the tariff, ship-building, rights to landed

property, and the evils of immigration, but have nothing to say of those integral moral problems that lie close to political welfare but which are essentially ethical in spirit and function. The greatest questions before the American people are not commercial, however important they may be, for such questions, tending to absorb the strength and substance, tend also to a materialization of the thought and life of the nation. Ships, tariff schedules ranging from silks to toys, and acreage are neither the sources of greatest prosperity nor the surest means of a nation's defense. The integrity of its citizenship; the education of the multitudes; the extinction of a class and sectional spirit; the virtue of the sexes; the reverence of the youth; the physical health of mothers and fathers; the moral purity of the conjugal relationship; the temperance and sabbatic love of the people, are the indispensable prerequisites of national strength, independence, growth, and security. A nation built upon a material foundation may perish; established in righteousness, the stars in their courses will fight for it, and Jehovah will bless it throughout all its generations. Such ends or social conditions as temperance, social purity, education, the reign of the Sabbath, and the authority of the Bible in civil life must in the minds of the people have precedence over the minor questions of navy, army, systems of trade, and development of internal resources. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

Insisting upon the sovereignty of moral problems, it is not to suggest the restoration of the Puritanic regime, though Puritanism was the germ of American civilization, or to invite the enactment of "blue laws" for the regulation and surveillance of human conduct. Such is the statesmanship of the great men of the nation that, coupled with a prudential regard for all interests, and a due respect for all sentiments and teachings, wise laws on moral lines are now possible, and for these the demand is strong enough to be heard. The thunder of Sinai and the music of Calvary re-echo in the nation's ears, and should melt and move the nation's heart. Should these moral problems appear in civil attire, and purely political questions disrobe of rags and put on the garments of righteousness, the hills would skip for joy, and the morning stars might be induced to sing over the work of the Lord in the earth. To this unity of the moral and political in civil life the American people are fast coming, and it is hoped that the near future will witness its consummation.

THE PREROGATIVES OF PHILOSOPHY.

The spirit of the age is scientific, philosophic, and religious—a complex influence in partial and almost unconscious co-operation for the execution of the historic ideal of humanity. Distinct in nature and different in method as are these front-line forces, they so often forget their boundaries and trespass upon those of their neighbors that it is not at all times easy to designate the one from the others, or give proper credit to them in

their conflict with the powers of darkness. Science is especially supercilious and iconoclastic, and without a trace of a natural or borrowed etiquette; philosophy, clothed in ermine and sitting with juridical temper on all the facts submitted to it, is presumptive only when driven out of its calmness by the shock of contact with theologic authority; while theology, robed in sackcloth, and weighted with heavy eyebrows, chants its requiem over error in mournful accents, or enlivens its Sinaitic and Gospel hymnals with outbursts of lightning or the more merciful pyrotechnics of grace. The specialty of science is fact; of philosophy, law; of theology, genesis of fact and law. He is a poor reader of the times who does not acknowledge the service of science in the realm of material forms. It registers facts thrown up by the spade from the crust of the earth; facts turned out by the scalpel as the human body is made to unroll its anatomy; facts dripping from the psychologist's pen as he inquires into the mind's machinery; facts heaped up by the biologist's hands as he fathoms all things for life; facts pointing to the Supreme Power as the *voicant* threads the avenues of being stretching out toward an infinite border-world. Whatever the motive of the scientist, whether pure love of knowledge, or a selfish acquaintance with the cosmos, or a silent agnosticism of soul, or a cherished alienation from accepted standards of truth, it must be conceded that his toil has been incessant and the reward abundant in the accumulation of material for the construction of universal science. Here his work should stop, but it is here that he turns the corner and commences a new line of investigation that properly belongs to another, and for which his preparation is suspiciously deficient. To this no objection would be made if he comprehended the seriousness of the task, or rose to the dignity of its requirement.

Philosophy is the advanced stage of the human intellect, regulating its work in the light of modern science and according to the canons of the soundest criticism. Its function is interpretation of what is, but the "is" must first be known to exist before it can even be investigated. Hence, science must precede philosophy, and philosophy must occupy a higher position than science. This explains the slow evolution of philosophic thought from Plato to the present time. Science was a tramp, eking out an existence on philosophy, and both dressed in rags and fed on wind until both were ready to perish and were treated as outcasts. Within our day science, discovering her sovereign capacity to be first in service, is pioneering human thought in the direction of fact, and philosophy is following with tests, criterions, application of intellectual therapeutics, and proposes to institute a final exegesis of the material universe. Hence, a philosophic era is dawning because science has prepared the way.

Assuming the philosophic function, the scientist undertook to explain his facts by the facts themselves, whereas no speech comes from the dust, no fact is self-explanatory, but is implicit with antecedent influence. Finding himself without philosophic equipment, he abjured its necessity, and has berated all attempts to revive the philosophic function as distinct and individual. Happily, the world-fact was against the scientist him-

self, and the only question he is now considering is, how to retreat from his advanced line without being discovered, and to resume his normal work with such enthusiasm as will atone for his absence from it.

The philosopher has rescued us from the embarrassment, and limited the scientific dominion to the sphere of facts. To-day, therefore, witnesses quite a march beyond the scientist. Darwin is in the rear. To-day is a-glow with *ideas*: a larger realm and brilliantly illuminated with terrestrial, if not celestial, gems of light. Every thing does not come to us from below: some things fall upon us from above. The change from facts to ideas has come quickly, sooner than was expected, and materialism has been exchanged for agnosticism; not exactly an equitable bargain, but a gain for the right side. Not a few have denied to philosophy a missionary prerogative, holding that its aim was too lofty to be realized, and that its method was abnormal and inutile. Suddenly, however, it has come to pass that the explanation of things is seen to constitute an inquiry, magnificent, colossal, and separate from the discovery of things, and the philosopher is empowered to orient the universe that the scientist has merely labeled as a fact.

In the blaze of the electric light of present-day philosophy, matter, spoken of by Cousin as more than a *thing*, stands forth not as a self-caused something, but as the oriental image of a personal thinker and law-giver, a potential maker of worlds without number and responsible only to himself. It may not be the province of the elder philosophy, which partakes of the scientific spirit, to pronounce the name of the Law-giver, but the younger or later philosophy, baptized by a Christian spirit, will proclaim Elohim as the founder of all things and blot out all other titles. The mechanical theory of mind, first tentatively held by Hartley, elegantly expounded by Hobbes, and scientifically elaborated by Alexander Bain, is surrendering to the philosophic conception of mind as a spiritual integer, with independent functions and an immortal life. Life itself, the conundrum of thinkers, is being referred to the All-Source, as partaking of it and finally returning to it. In the foreground of science is a universe alive but cold—a Topsy-figure in unmeasured space; in the great picture of philosophy is a universe, with Deity in the background as Causer, Explainer, the All-Agency in all things. Pursuing its function with the zeal that belongs to it, philosophy will prepare the way for the still higher and more beneficent task of theology, which is to reveal to the thought of man the character, purposes, methods, and works of the all-embracing Deity whom sages ever announced, if at all, with bated breath, because they could not understand him. The prerogative of philosophy, broader and richer than that of science, is less than that of theology; but, as one may see, it is the connecting link between science and theology, as law is the connection between fact and its origin. The birth of science was the birth of materialism; the dawn of philosophy is the resurrection of ideas, and the submergence of materialism; the sway of theology is the restored reign of God in human thought, and the consequent extinction of the theoric spirit in opposition to God.

THE ARENA.

As its name implies, this department suggests pleasant intellectual contests among those who differ on philosophical, theological, ethical, social, and political subjects, and a field for criticisms, opinions, and suggestions along any of the lines of thought or action within the province of the *Review*. The giants of thought may draw their swords and challenge to combat; the critics may expose the weakness of the enemy, or groan over the wounds they have received; inquirers may indicate difficulties in faith, reason, and religion; and Christianity, government, society, and literature may contend, each in its way, for its rights and title to dominion. Thinkers! write, limiting yourselves to two hundred words.

"IN THE BEGINNING," OR "IN BEGINNING"—WHICH?

In the *Methodist Review* for September the editor asks, "Why do scholars persistently translate בְּרֵאשִׁית (Gen. i, 1) 'in the beginning,' when the article is entirely absent? If the exactly literal translation—'in beginning'—were printed in the Bible it would change the meaning of the verse," etc.

It is presumed the Editor raised the question to excite thought, and though I cannot claim to be "the Hebraist," yet I shall give some reasons for adhering to the translation as given in both the Authorized and Revised Versions, and as it is recognized by most commentators and scholars.

Though the preposition הַ is absent, is it not implied or understood?

Consider: 1. The word בְּרֵאשִׁית is not a participle, nor a participial noun, nor is it derived from the verb meaning *to begin*, as used in Gen. xi, 6, which Moses Stuart renders, "This is their commencing to operate, or the commencing of their operations."

2. This word is a noun, meaning *a beginning, earlier state, earlier thing, the first of its kind*, and is a modified form of רֵשִׁית, *a beginning*. It is derived from the substantive רֵאשִׁית, *ahead, the first, the beginning*.

3. The same word (הֲרֵאשִׁיתֶיכֶם), modified by a prefix and a suffix, occurs in Ezek. xxxvi, 11, and means, as it is translated, "at your beginnings," not in your beginning things.

4. This position is supported by a reference to Gen. i, 1, in the Septuagint. The Seventy translated the Hebrew by *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, *In the beginning*. The preposition *ἐν* corresponds to בַּ in Hebrew, and *ἀρχῇ*, takes the place and has the meaning of בְּרֵאשִׁית. As in the Hebrew, so here, the article *τῇ* is absent. Dr. Robinson (*Lexicon*) says, "*ἐν ἀρχῇ, in the beginning, in the very first, before the world began, from eternity.*"

5. Dr. Bloomfield on John's Gospel i, 1, says: "*ἐν ἀρχῇ—scil. τοῦ κόσμου.* The expression answers to the Hebrew בְּרֵאשִׁית in Gen. i, 1, which the evangelist seems to have in mind. By *ἀρχῇ* is here meant the origin of all things; and *ἐν ἀρχῇ* is for *ἐκ ἀρχῆς*; and the expression is evidently meant to designate eternity."

6. Both lexicographers and grammarians say that ב, as a prefix before a noun of time, is equivalent to *in* with the dative, and that the Hebrew article ה, commonly written ה, corresponds nearly with the definite article *the* in English, and in Gen. i, 1, is a prefix to אֶרֶץ, *earth*, and to שָׁמַיִם, *heavens*. And the reason the article is omitted in בְּרֵאשִׁית is, it suffers *syncope* after ב, and gives up its vowel to the particle. The syncope of the article is common. (Stuart's *Grammar*, sec. 152, note, and sec. 108, 6.)

BOSTWICK HAWLEY.

AN ITINERANTS' CLUB.

Dr. John A. Broadus, one of the most accomplished scholars and one of the most charming preachers of the Baptist Church, in an address on Bible study before the Kentucky Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at its recent session in Louisville, heartily commended the policy of the Baptist and Methodist Episcopal Churches in bringing into the ministry men of natural ability with simply a public school education, and such biblical and theological training as may be secured by the denominational seminaries. He showed how unwise and impracticable it is for churches which aim to carry the Gospel to the multitude, to require thorough collegiate and theological education on the part of all ministers. Bible scholars should be familiar with Hebrew and with New Testament Greek; educated in ecclesiastical history and pastoral and systematic theology; but he claimed that it would be worse than folly to condition in every case ordination as ministers of the Gospel upon rigid examination in the ancient classics, in mathematics, and other studies of the college curriculum. There is no danger that the Methodist Episcopal Church will ever make such imperative requirement. The fact that she is in no such danger should, however, be an argument in favor of greater strictness in the studies and examinations already required in conjunction with the Annual Conferences. The problem is this: How shall we make the general, biblical, theological, and ecclesiastical examinations on the four years' Course of Study more complete and satisfactory; a fairer test of actual attainment, and an incentive and encouragement to really ambitious students? I shall not here attempt to point out the defects of the system in its present practical working, but to suggest tentatively a scheme which will go far toward correcting such defects.

Let the Four Years' Conference Examiners and the Four Years' Undergraduates meet once, twice, or thrice during the Conference year in some central place—an educational institution preferred—for reading, studies, the outlining of books, lectures on systematical and practical theology, specimen lessons to illustrate the method of teaching the Catechism, Bible geography, Bible biography, the history, doctrines, and usages of our Church, and for conversations on how to present most successfully the "benevolences" to our people; how to increase the salary, etc., etc. Such an "Itinerants' Club" will meet in winter session in Louisville, Ky., the approaching season.

JOHN H. VINCENT.

FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO.

It would require the gift of prophecy to say with exactness what will be the future of the American Negro. Judging from his present situation, which is both peculiar and critical, I should say that his advancement must be somewhat slow and unsteady—so many are the forces acting for and against him. The following, however, are certainties:

1. He will never again be a slave in this republic. Neither the interests of the country nor his own appreciation of liberty will allow that.

2. That he is here to stay has become a hackneyed phrase, and is regarded by sensible people as a self-evident truth.

3. Nor will he always be an underling; for although it is the purpose of many to keep him so, yet in the very faces of these he is accumulating property and acquiring knowledge—two things which insure power, self-respect, and manly independence. Surely that man has read history in vain who believes that seven millions of people, doubling their number every twenty years, will demand less than their inalienable rights as men, and their guaranteed rights as American citizens. W. H. CROGMAN.

THE VEXED QUESTION.

I felt a keen anxiety that the last General Conference should adopt some broad and liberal measure promotive of the reunion of our two Methodisms. The question will never down. It is one of those issues which draw their vitality out of the bosom of eternal righteousness.

Our Church schism foreran by many years the civil schism which rent the nation. The Church, being ahead of civil society in morality, struck the rock first, and was shattered. Then our political ship split on the same reef. When the actual conflict was over, secular society, with the instinct of self-preservation, set to work to mend and restore the broken vessel. Remember the language of Lincoln and Grant: "Let us bind up the nation's wounds;" "Let us have *peace*." These are immortal words, and the smoke was still in the field when they were uttered.

With as much speed as possible our civil feud was healed. The autonomy and vitality of every part was quickly restored in its relations with the whole. Union, reunion, was the watchword until it was accomplished. Every agent, every agency which impeded this salutary restoration of our unity appears already at a disadvantage in the light of the retrospect. Whoever opposed the rebuilding and reconsecration of our national temple has already passed under the ban of history.

What have we here? Will the Church be the *last* in reuniting on the basis of a common hope and a common destiny? Shall she which was the first to suffer be the last to heal? Shall the separated parts of our common Methodism stand asunder for a quarter of a century after civil society, wiser in its generation, has repaired its break and at least *tried* to forget its calamity? *Μη γένοιο.* JOHN CLARK RIDPATH.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF ATHEISM.

Atheism is a denial of the existence of God, but such denial amounts to nothing unless supported by affirmative facts and principles which lead to that conclusion. It, then, must have a basis of its own made up of positive affirmations outside and independent of Christianity. But the principles of this dark speculation have ever been so very shifting and uncertain that it has been difficult to subject them to the tests of philosophical criticism. But before rejecting all religion, natural and revealed, we have a right to know what will take its place; and if it is to be atheism, we demand that the facts and principles on which it rests be put into logical order for our inspection. Has this ever been done? We have systems of theology, systems of ethics, systems of political economy, but are yet to meet atheism *per se* reduced to a system of thought. In the absence of affirmative principles atheism is a sweeping but empty negation. But scattered through atheistic literature we meet here and there with affirmative statements which seem to serve as the base to the conclusions reached, and it may be the duty of Christian authors to gather these together and subject them to the sharpest analysis, to the widest generalization, and see how they look in the hot focus of philosophical criticism. Atheism in philosophy, we think, would be like flax in a flame.

H. H. MOORE.

THE EDUCATIONAL AIMS OF UNBELIEF.

Little doubt remains as to precisely what infidelity proposes to accomplish in the educational systems and institutions of the United States. In his *Political Science*, published ten years ago, Dr. Woolsey wrote: "We have not yet quite reached the extreme that the teacher must never mention God to children's ears, but it must logically come if modern unbelief is to have the career that many look for." The logic of events has confirmed the logic of this unwelcome prediction, and in less than a decade it has been fulfilled. An education purely secular is now the demand of some. By these the Bible is denounced as a sectarian book, unfit to be read in the public schools; and moral principles are ignored in the curricula and lecture-rooms on the specious plea that the State cannot undertake to teach sectarianism.

Schools are for learning, and learning is for life. All concepts of education that sink the human in the scholastic, and make scholarship the end of life, are false and mischievous. Life is the end of scholarship. We educate our children that they may know how to live and make the most of their opportunities. As Christians, we believe that their moral nature should receive its requisite share of attention. Intellectual training alone will not meet the demand. Lecky, in his *History of European Morals*, says: "It is one of the plainest of facts that neither the individuals nor the ages that have been most distinguished for intellectual achievements have been most distinguished for moral excellence; and

that a high intellectual and material civilization has often co-existed with much depravity." On the contrary, he says: "Many of the most splendid outbursts of moral enthusiasm may be traced to an overwhelming force of conviction rarely found in cultivated minds." We do not fancy the modern trend of things toward the ideal supremacy of intellectual culture as the end and aim of life. It is a step backward, not forward. Its highest good was attained in ancient Athens, a city wholly given to idolatry, and in Rome, as brutal and licentious a metropolis as history exhibits.

Our children are entitled to as thorough a moral training as our fathers received. They require that kind of instruction which recognizes their responsibility and immortality, and fits them not only to think, but to think wisely; not only to reason, but to reason in harmony with the will and ways of God; and the friends of Christian morality must come to the defense of this right if they would save the rising generation from the seductive influences of that subtle unbelief which is rapidly transforming our public school system into the educational ideals of atheism.

JAMES H. POTTS.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN BOSTON.

Roman Catholicism assumes supremacy in Boston. The spirit of this ecclesiasticism is the spirit which was dominant in the Middle Ages. Its political ascendancy has been characterized by the most disreputable proceedings. A preacher is sent to prison for a year for the crime (?) of preaching the Gospel, and holding religious services decently and in order on Boston Common, while "Buffalo Bill" is given license to exhibit his "Wild West" on Sunday afternoon within city limits, and his Honor (?) the Mayor gives his approval to professional pugilism by attending a meeting which was called together to present a prize (?) belt to the brute Sullivan.

Roman Catholic priests denounce the common schools, and set up their protests in the form of un-American parochial schools. Not satisfied with the compulsory withdrawal of Roman Catholic children from the public schools, they ask to have Roman Catholics elected members of the School Board, Roman Catholic teachers and Roman Catholic instruction in the schools whenever Roman Catholic majorities obtain, thus setting city ordinances to defy the constitution of the Commonwealth.

The Roman Catholics seek to suppress the indisputable facts of history by expurgating from the schools an authentic book, and by removing a teacher from the chair of instruction which he has filled acceptably for twenty years. And lastly, they seek to evade responsibility for the course they pursue by taking positions which are untenable, setting forth reasons which are unreasonable, and making statements which are untrue.

J. W. HAMILTON.

EDITORIAL REVIEWS.

FOREIGN RÉSUMÉ.

THE GENERAL SITUATION.

THE religious world of the old continent is quite generally startled with a new movement on the part of the Catholic Church, evidently induced by commands from Rome. This is nothing less than a revival of the *Kulturkampf*. The decree that renews throughout Europe this unfortunate contest goes forth from a recent Catholic convention held in Freiburg, at the particular request and with the apostolic blessing of the Pontiff. This new drama has as its sphere of action no less than three fields—the school, the temporal power of the pope, and the question of the religious orders.

The leader of the old party of the Center in the German Parliament—the now famous Windhorst—was evidently the constructor of the programme, and he chose his arenas to renew the struggle with great skill, for “agitation” is his watchword. Beyond this he cannot go, whatever may be his illusions in the matter. Lightning does not strike twice in the same place. His foes now know his tactics, and will use them to defeat their creator. The story that the pope rules the world is a very old one, but it has of late lost its flavor by defeat. The new feature now is, that the direct appeal is not to the spiritual subjects of the pope, but to governments and persons who have never conceded that he has any right to rule the world. The Napoleonic era broke the charm of that fantasy, and it will never again be able to resume its full power.

The line of action now is the unseemly meddling, not alone with the external but even with the internal affairs of the kingdom of Italy—a species of bold declaration of war against the Italian people and kingdom simply because these deemed Rome to be the capital of Italy, and equality between clergy and laity on the platform of civil duties and criminal proceedings. This assumption is now the more unseemly from the fact that Germany recently resented it, and is now in alliance with Italy politically in the interest of general peace, and any violation of this etiquette on the part of Germany towards Italy would kindle a fire that might lead to a general revolution in Europe.

The presentation of such demands just now appears as a challenge, and no nation would yield to these irreconcilable worthies of the Church which would mold foreign policy according to the good pleasure of the Holy See. The most that Germany could do in this direction it has done, namely, given an ambassador to the Vatican to reside in Rome and maintain friendly intercourse of the Catholic Church of Germany with the Pontifical court at Rome. The German Emperor on his late visit to Rome kept up the supposed independence of the Vatican from the Italian government by starting on his visit to the Pope in his own state carriage

from the embassy, and therefore by a silly sort of fiction keeping up the appearance of temporal sovereignty of the Vatican. But in his private interview with the Roman Pontiff it is understood that the Emperor gave the Pope no hope of the interference of Germany for a restoration of the temporal power. The court of the Vatican is greatly chagrined at this disappointment, and now sounds the tocsin all along the line among Catholic nations to come to the rescue. But the slightest movement in this direction on the part of any would be the signal for an outbreak that all intensely fear.

I. RELIGIOUS.

IN FRANCE the order of the day seems to be revision, whether for better or for worse. The Reformed Church appears to be struck with this spirit of unrest as well as the politicians. The demand there has been for some time revision of the liturgy, or rather, we may say, a selection of the fittest from the various forms for some time in use. The General Synod appointed a commission for this purpose, with Pastor Bersier at the head of it. A better choice could not have been made, for he is not only the leading pulpit orator of the Protestant Church in France, but also a well-known liturgist, as he has demonstrated in his own attractive church near the Arc de Triomphe, in Paris, where he to a select public has given his own beautiful liturgy, as his is a branch of the Free Church. A Protestant congregation abroad finds it very tame and dispiriting not to have some exercise in which all can take a prominent part.

Last summer there appeared a trial compilation entitled, "*Projet de Revision de la liturgie des Eglise Reformées de France*," with an historical introduction and a critical commentary. This work is quite an advance toward the liturgy of the Lutheran Church of France, though this is not acknowledged as such expressly by Bersier. He was obliged in his work to reckon above all things with the leading views of the Reformed Church, while not entirely disregarding some of the rationalistic views of later periods, and not adopting too much of the old Reformed liturgies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

He appears to seek honestly to give to his brethren in the faith the sound principles of a thoughtful and serious church service in which not so much a sermon as a spiritual worship shall appear, that shall draw the entire congregation to a direct participation in the public worship. He restores the divisions of the church year, and gives to the Sabbaths their old ecclesiastical names. He demands in every service of the Sabbath the usual confession of sins, and adds to it the absolution, though not in the strong form introduced by Calvin. The question of the absolution will be the delicate one for the Synod, and will doubtless be warmly contested. It is to be hoped that the result will be in this line to unite all the Reformed Churches of France.

FRENCH SWITZERLAND seems cursed with an era of levity and dissipation. The days of fasting and prayer that were formerly observed with

much sincerity are now mainly devoted to pleasure and excesses. This state of things has become so dangerous and distasteful to the more thoughtful element of society that the town council of Lausanne on the last fast-day thought it fitting and advisable to issue an appeal to the people to observe it. Thus far it is comforting at least to know that both the republic and the monarchies of Europe think it desirable to instill into the popular mind the worth and significance of religious ways and guidance.

This appeal from a civil body addressed to the people in the interest of morality and religion is so rare and peculiar that we think it well worth transcribing in brief as an example. It runs as follows: "Justice elevates a people; sin is the shame of nations; order and prosperity are impossible without the fear of God. We trust in God, who has hitherto protected this land, and invite you, our fellow-citizens, to give him thanks for his ever-renewed deeds of mercy. Though a few erring spirits venture to demand the separation of religion from society, though they endeavor to exclude God from public and private life, from the hospitals and the schools, from the home and even from the Church, our people see, nevertheless, that without the help of a strong God and a firm faith social progress is but an imperfect work. Our nation is a Christian nation because it is, and will remain, free. It believes in the kingdom of Christ, and that it is a rule of justice, peace, and truth, and that the Gospel is a power. Fellow-citizens, let us watch over ourselves, let us watch over our youth and make them the objects of our greatest care. The school shall endeavor to impart useful knowledge, but it is for the home hearth to impart those teachings that will make our youth good and great."

This refreshing admonition of a civic council was so different from the traditional phrases of thanksgiving documents that it produced a great impression throughout the land. The scoffers called it the "*pastoral letter*" of the city fathers, but all moral and Christian people rejoiced at this unexpected call from government circles for the cause of soberness and religion. The result was that a monster excursion to a neighboring town that was planned for the holiday was given up, and the good people of Lausanne spent the day as their fathers were wont to, in thoughtfulness and quiet thanksgiving and prayer.

That this action of the Council was needed may be learned from the influence exerted by it, and from a comparison with other localities on that same day. From Geneva, not far distant, from the city of John Calvin, from the "Protestant Rome," which is frequently quoted as the most intelligently Christian city of Europe, no less than twenty thousand persons went out to a great resort known as the Salvêe, and other pleasure resorts. This movement on the part of Lausanne ought to do good, and we sincerely hope that it will. But when popular customs are fastened on a people it is not very easy to uproot them. The good example of Lausanne should be tried another year in every center of Switzerland, because it is sorely needed.

JERUSALEM AND BETHLEHEM are receiving an unusual meed of attention just now. Five churches are in course of construction. Two Russian grand princes are expected to be present at the dedication of the Gethsemane Church, an event which clearly has a sort of ecclesiastical and political bearing combined. The Second Russian Church, just beside that of the Holy Sepulcher, is rising in costly material and stately proportions, and will be ready for consecration next year. The hospice for aristocratic Russian pilgrims, north of the Russian New Jerusalem, is also rising in stately outlines, with a cloister and girls' school in the vicinity. One wondered for awhile where the money came from for all these enterprises, but it has recently come to light that it is provided by the Russian Palestine Association, whose members are wealthy Russians.

The Abyssinian Coptic Church is a beautiful circular building with a cupola, and is now under roof, making quite an ornament to the surroundings. In Bethlehem the church of the friar Belloni is about half up, and the Protestant Church is now rising above the foundation. The Greeks recently placed a cross on the cupola of the Church of the Sepulcher, and this work was done in a single night and caused great excitement in the Romish camp; for, according to Oriental ideas, whatever nation sets a cross on a church has a right to all it contains.

Nothing of special political importance has occurred in Palestine of late. The last *coup d'état* was the Sultan's blow at the Jews, prohibiting their immigration to the Holy Land. But their leaders obtained the privilege of remaining three months in the holy city, visiting the graves and holy places. But on the other hand the government seems to allow all sorts of wild tribes, as the Turcomans and Circassians, to settle east of the Jordan. This commingling of strangers with the native Bedouins gives rise to a good deal of fighting and skirmishing that does not always end without bloodshed. This antagonism of races is sometimes very bitter and fatal. A party of Mohammedans were discovered by Christian customs officers smuggling tobacco into Beyroot. This interference of the Christian with the Turk caused a great deal of bitterness, and the whole town took sides in the squabble, the line being clearly drawn between the creeds. For a time there was great danger of a bloody riot, but by some means the tumult was quieted. Palestine seems on the eve of a great struggle between nationalities and creeds, in which Russians and Jews will be prominent.

BRAZIL is in quite a flutter of excitement because of the rejection of a petition of the Protestants of the realm to be allowed to worship in a public manner. The matter was received well in the Senate, but failed in the House. The members of the Cabinet who in the Senate seemed to favor the request, evidently soon received a hint from the higher power, and thought it better to put off the matter for a season. The appeal comes from a large body of German Protestants settled in the province of Rio Grande do Sul.

The cause of this treatment was the appearance of a counter petition with

twelve thousand signatures, mainly from the ladies of the upper classes of Rio; and it is said that at the head of this petition stands the name of the Crown Princess Isabel, the late regent during the absence of the Emperor Dom Pedro. This suspicion puts a very serious phase on the matter, for a lady so devoid of tact in the present crisis of the country as to do so unwise a thing can hardly be safely intrusted with the regency. The excitement among the Protestant population is very great, and it is considered as an insult that light and air are denied to their form of worship. It has been hard to bear the legacy of former times in this matter, when Protestantism was not at all known and the rule came from Portugal. But that the same feeling should now exist in the higher regions of government, notwithstanding the unanimous request of all Protestant congregations of the land, it is hard to conceive.

The truth is, that there is a good deal of tinder heaped up in Brazil, and all have the feeling that it will soon come to an explosion. The Emperor has returned, but he is a sick man, and must soon die, and the succession is a matter of much doubt. He was evidently not very well pleased with the regency of his daughter, and hurried back at the risk of dying on the way to resume the reins of government. The crown princess during his absence committed a great stroke of policy in liberating all the slaves a little before the legally appointed time, but the feeling is that she has received too much credit for it. At least it is hazardous for her to believe that this act permits her with impunity to be unjust to a large body of intelligent and valuable citizens who came into the land in the expectation that their inborn rights should be regarded. In her policy she did violence to the parliamentary system, and in religious matters she is thought to be under the influence of the Jesuits. It is now thought that the Senate would not receive the abdication of the monarch in favor of his daughter. The Republicans will do all they can against her ascent to the throne. They favor the son-in-law of the emperor, a Saxon prince.

CARDINAL LAVIGERIE, the Archbishop of Algiers and Primate of Africa, is entering the African arena with much vigor, and the avowed determination of stamping out the huge vice of slavery from the entire continent. It is sad to know that this is a very heavy contract, but he proposes to go at his work with the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other. The Cardinal has been busy for twenty years in the mission work in Africa. He began by founding the congregations of the "White Fathers," or missionaries of the Holy Virgin of Algiers, which body sent to Leo XIII. in 1878 an address wherein they say that they have but one wish, namely, to save the souls of these unbelievers by bringing to them the words of the Gospel until they die in the service.

This order now has a novitiate in the *Maison Carrée* in Algiers, wherein are prepared all the novices for mission service in Africa. Since that time these White Fathers have founded a series of mission schools in various parts of Europe—in France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany.

They have also settlements in Jerusalem, and in the vicinity of Rome. Although within the last ten years twelve of these White Fathers have met a martyr's death in Africa the result of their missionary activity has not been especially gratifying, and but few negroes have been brought over to Christianity. But notwithstanding this they have already founded eleven stations in the region of Lake Albert Nyanza, and an apostolic vicariate. To aid in this work the cardinal is now about to send out female missionaries.

In the summer of 1887 he established in the Dutch city of Maestricht a missionary cloister for Africa, and soon had twelve women under vows for the work. As to the province of the sword in this work of suppressing slavery, the Cardinal is endeavoring to create an international armed body which shall be composed entirely of volunteers, who shall be supported by a fund contributed by all the States interested in African matters. To effect this purpose Lavigerie is now making the tour of European States. It is said that the Pope will send a circular to the Powers in the interest of this enterprise. For the volunteer legion that is to operate on Tanganyika Lake one hundred and fifty have already enlisted, and anti-slavery committees have been formed to collect funds in Belgium and elsewhere. The King is not very favorable to the movement. He would reach the negroes by peaceful methods.

"VACATION COLONIES" are a new move on the part of the Germans. An international convention recently held in Zurich, called together at the instigation of German philanthropists, discussed the plan of forming so-called *vacation colonies* for the retreat of children of the cities during the summer months. The experiment is a brilliant success in Germany, having been in progress for some time. Nearly ten thousand children were assembled last summer from seventy-two cities. The reports of the convention were interesting and encouraging. The founding of these summer colonies under careful hygienic control was declared to be a fitting work for the friends of childhood every-where. In these establishments the children are not idle, but are usually engaged in some sort of object-lesson training while gaining health and strength for the winter.

BISHOP STROSSMAYER, of Croatia, has rather a hard time with the authorities, who are in favor of the Ultramontane Church. When the Emperor of Austria was recently in Pesth with the Crown Prince he gave a reception to the Catholic clergy of Hungary. The Emperor, having greeted very kindly several of the archbishops and bishops, turned to Strossmayer, and openly said, concerning a certain telegram expressed in liberal terms, sent to Kiev on the occasion of the assembling of the Russo-Greek Church in that ancient city: "I would not have thought that one of my subjects could have been guilty of such an act. This telegram was an insult to the Catholic Church and the monarchy. You appeared not to know what you were doing; you were sick." Bishop Strossmayer,

bowing to the Emperor, said quite loud: "My conscience is clean, your majesty." The Bishop is the leader of the Croatian opposition to the Hungarian rule. Were it not for this such an unusual scene between an emperor and a bishop would never have occurred.

II. LITERARY.

THE SCHOOLS OF FRANCE are not in a very cordial condition in the matter of religion and conscience. Relations are so strained that the courts are frequently called in to settle disputes. The Court of Appeals in Paris recently found it necessary to sit in judgment on the decree of a lower court from the following cause: A wealthy Protestant in central France conceived the praiseworthy idea of collecting in his own house a number of little girls from ten to twelve years of age to enjoy with his own children the religious instruction of a special teacher, engaged and paid by himself. For this act he was summoned before the school inspector of the district and condemned to a fine because he had established a primary school in his own house. He appealed to a local court and lost his case, and then came to the higher court of Paris, which reversed the decision. The Court of Appeals decided that as religious instruction is no longer imparted in the primary schools, therefore it is the privilege of every Frenchman to have his children instructed in that branch privately without a special permit from the government.

This decision is of great importance for French Protestants, and greatly pleases them; otherwise the Thursday schools and Sunday-schools were in danger, which are taught mostly by laymen, without a certificate from the higher schools. But the wonder and the pity are, that such a question could be raised in liberal France as whether a parent may be permitted to have his children taught in his own house by a teacher of his own choice, and this in the matter of religion. The government supports the public schools, and licenses schools carried on by private teachers who have certificates of competency from the higher schools. Here it certainly ought to stop. The public school system in France has been greatly developed since the decree for taking the schools out of the hands of the Church. There are now about 80,000 primary schools and 13,000 so-called private schools, that is, taught by professional teachers on their own terms. The pupils now run up into the millions, and the increase has been steady and rapid. The great trouble has been to obtain lay teachers, because of the almost universal custom until lately of employing the priests and the nuns. But the demand has produced a supply that is yearly growing in number and quality. In the rural regions the influence of the Church is still very strong, and it makes out to control them with teachers that assume to be from the laity, though every body knows that in time and place these same teachers are of the Church.

CARDINAL BONNECHOSE has just re-appeared to a French audience in a very interesting biography. In life he was very active and outspoken,

and his biography revives many of the incidents in the life of Pius IX. The future cardinal was the child of a Protestant mother, his father was indifferent, and the son was allowed to embrace the Catholic faith. To this he was more than loyal—he was partial. Every thing in his way had to yield before the authority of the Church. For forty years he was the constant plenipotentiary between the various governments and the court of Rome. He asked but one thing of them, and that was to serve the papacy. He was the friend of the third Napoleon as long as he governed for the profit of Catholicism. When the King of Prussia was crowned Emperor of Germany at Versailles this prelate hastened to demand of him the restoration of the temporal power. The Cardinal was the sworn enemy of every liberal tendency, and declared before the Senate, “I govern my clergy as a regiment.”

FREDERICK RUCKERT was one of the purest and sweetest poets of his age, and his centenary was recently celebrated with great enthusiasm. At the age of twenty-two his “German Poems” appeared, and immediately stamped him as a patriot and Christian. His life-long aspiration was the unity of Germany, which he did not live to see. Orientalism was his favorite field, and he published the *Wisdom of Brahma*, in twenty volumes, containing the richest creations of Hindoo philosophy. He became professor of Oriental tongues at Erlangen and then at Berlin. His *Life of Jesus* in verse did not meet the welcome that it perhaps deserved, and he then turned to lyrical poetry, in which he occupied a large place in German letters. The very titles of some of these are most attractive to childhood—childlike and simple, but containing great truths in the garb of simplicity, as for example: “A Little Story to put to Sleep a Little Sister;” “The Little Boy who Wished to be Taken Every-where;” “The Little Tree that Wanted Other Leaves.”

THE SWISS PROTESTANTS recently met in a convocation at Lausanne, and their words savored of the true spirit of broad Christianity. In several of the addresses tender allusions were made to the beloved Vinet, so well known in this country by his works. In his words they declared that they wished, as did Christ, nothing but to save men. In this beautiful reunion of Christian workers on the borders of *Leman* there was no dissonance and no bitter discussion. The eminent president alluded with real satisfaction to the softening of theological strife in Switzerland. The Protestants have become more liberal, and the Liberals more pious. But with this progress there is no abandonment of essential Christianity. It was *in necessariis unitas*, and only *in dubiis libertas*. Ecclesiastical peace will be very dear to the Swiss if it can be obtained without too much sacrifice, and the general tenor of all the utterances on this occasion was unity among the evangelical population of the country.

PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.

EVOLUTION, as Herbert Spencer formulates it, is enjoying a temporary revival, but its power to modify theological belief is exceedingly problematical. The Brooklyn Ethical Association, which meets fortnightly, proposes to spend the winter in discussing the evolution of the earth, of morals and theology, and the effects of the doctrine on religious thought and the coming civilization. Midway in the course the proofs of evolution as the secret of the world's being will be announced. The proofs will be interesting, for the world has been patiently waiting for them. As Mr. Spencer is in communication with the Association he may furnish them, in which event we know what they will be in advance; but we suggest that evidences that convince the reason are needed in the effort to establish the pet dogma. That evolution is the spirit of history the devout mind believes; but it is theistic evolution—the opposite of that theory that permits an atheistic conclusion and solves superficially the problems of the universe—that wins the faith and respect of the theologian. The recent action of the South Carolina Synod condemning the action of the Charleston Presbytery in the case of the Rev. Dr. James Woodrow, who espoused the Christian form of evolution and taught it in the theological seminary, is worthy of commendation; for to prohibit the teaching of the doctrine, as was intended by the expulsion of the professor, is in conflict with freedom of thought, the right of the citizen to independent judgment, and the triumph of the truth associated with it. The conflict is Atheistic *versus* Theistic Evolution, with the chances in favor of the latter. The Association represents one phase, the Presbytery the other, of the great controversy.

Though warranted in theorizing on the contents of "mounds" it is premature to establish conclusions from them, and ask the world to accept them. Relics of great value have been found in Central America—as an inscribed stone in Guatemala and layers of rock covered with human footprints in Nicaragua—but it is too soon to infer from them a great prehistoric age for man. An antiquarian, poetic in spirit, has concluded that the mound-building instinct prevails in Mars, our planetary neighbor, and from what he has discovered in that world he reasons to what would have happened on the earth if a more generous civilization had not extinguished, or at least superseded it. We insist that not imagination but reason must appropriate the facts in this field, and that not science but theory has only been attained in the study of the monuments of the extinct people who once inhabited the western hemisphere. The American Antiquarian Society must resist the tendency to fanciful speculations on a subject that is purely historical, and depends for its development upon the scientific and historical spirit. The finding of six skeletons of Toltecs in Dakota does not prove the existence of a race of giants; nor is it conclusive that the squares and circles in the Scioto Valley, in Southern Ohio,

were built by the Cherokees because they resemble the later fortifications of that tribe; nor do the petroglyphs in Arizona justify all the conclusions of Mr. Cushing, the explorer, respecting the worship, customs, and habits of the people they represent. The science of the mounds is in the juvenile period, and is no more authentic than the early geologies of the century. Facts, not speculations, and all the facts before speculation, will dignify the conclusions reached and awaken faith in them.

Aryanism is the fundamental problem of ethnology. Robert Gordon Latham, the English philologist, proposed a European origin for the Aryan race; but Dr. Horatio Hall, of Canada, files physiological, philological, and geographical objections to the theory, assigning the primitive stock to the plains of Persia. That the Aryans early migrated westward into Europe, conquering the Semitic, Iberian, and Uranian peoples whom they found there, is almost a settled historic fact; and that by amalgamation a new, stronger, more aggressive, and more highly cultured race was the result Europe itself is the proof. The evidence of the unity of the Indo-European nations is chiefly linguistic, the Asiatics adopting the Germanic tongues of primeval Europe. In the long stretches of the ages the European has outrun the Asiatic; the latter clinging to superstition and still worshipping idols, the former shaping society into civilization, accepting the moral code of the Judaic law-giver, examining and receiving the religion of the New Testament, and worshipping the Most High, who is over all continents and kingdoms. In the evolution of things it is likely to happen that the real unity of all nations will be, not language, but religion, or the spiritualization of the race, with its allotropic subdivisions, through the perfect image of humanity in Jesus Christ. This achieved, Aryanism will be valuable only as an ethnographic relic.

Modernism is invading the Vatican. Complaining of his self-imposed prison-life, the Pope, nevertheless, looking out upon the seething world, is troubled over the slave-trade in distant Africa, and deposes Cardinal Lavigerie to London to implore the English nation to suppress the great crime. Perhaps it was while he was cogitating upon the horrors of the slave traffic that he concluded to broaden a little on the general subject of liberty, and really issued an encyclical apparently favoring a doctrine he and his predecessors had opposed for centuries. If he could see the necessity for modern light in Spain, Mexico, South America, France, Austria, and Italy perhaps he would depute England or the United States to establish schools in those countries and preach a little Protestantism to the iron-bound masses of Catholicism. Throw open the shutters, O man of the miter, and let in a little of the sunlight that makes glad the progressive nations of the world—Germany, England, and the United States; the greatest, the most Protestant, and beyond the leavening power of Jesuitical hypocrisy!

An irenicon from the Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops in favor of the recognition of the validity of the ministry of non-episcopal dissenting bodies is an advance that augurs a some time organic unity of ceremonially dissimilar Church organizations. And it was proper that such proposition should emanate from the Church which, always too self-centered, has been unable to discern the providential authorization of other communions. The unity of Protestantism depends, not upon dissentient Christian bodies, but upon the larger evolution of those smaller Protestant hide-bound religious aristocracies that hitherto reserved the prerogative of ordination, or the right to Churchhood, to themselves. Without an abandonment of history, but correcting their hoary error, the Anglican bishops assent to the ministerial function in bodies not dependent upon them for grace, ordination, wisdom, efficiency, religion, or heaven. This is well; let the development proceed.

The locomotive must be regarded as an old-world pioneer of modern civilization. Through Bulgarian enterprise a railway has been completed from Paris to Constantinople, shortening the distance between them forty-eight hours. While Prince Ferdinand rejoiced in this triumph the Sultan opposed a public jubilee over the achievement, and instructed the people to be silent when the first train proceeded through his territory on its journey. The Russians are also building a railroad from Teheran, with the consent of the Shah, to Resht, on the Caspian Sea, uniting the dominion of Darius with that of the Great Bear in the north. A still more significant project is the contemplated railway line from Scutari, the Asiatic quarters of Constantinople, to Bagdad on the Tigris, opening a country fourteen hundred miles in length to the influences of European civilization, and advancing Asia Minor, as Mr. Jewett says, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. An English syndicate is responsible for the financial outlay, and Englishmen are the contractors and will be the proprietors of the completed railroad. Not to be outdone in this particular, some Americans are planning for the construction of a railroad from Minnesota through the Dominion of Canada and over Behring Straits to China, a distance of about five thousand miles. This is the age of steam and the Gospel, of railroad tracks and itinerant preachers, of the locomotive and Arminianism, and, working together, the world should be civilized and Christianized by the knell of the present century.

The specialty of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is moral reform. Waiting long for the subsidence of corroding evils, hoping for legislation, education, and that impulse to progress that belongs to practical optimism, but waiting and hoping somewhat in vain, the gentler sex have organized against the threatening tide of iniquity in the land. He who studies the leadership of this movement, as well as the movement itself, must acknowledge that as seers and reformers they are as impetuous as Deborah and Joan of Arc, with every prospect of a complete attain-

ment of their object. That social impurity, with the twin vice of intemperance, is alarmingly common, no informed citizen will controvert; that extravagance in dress and love of fashion control the American home is patent to all observers; that scientific temperance instruction of youth is required for the protection of the future, parents, physicians, and teachers at once affirm. Unless vice is checked and the minor manners of the people are refined, Zechariah's flying roll, filled with curses, will visit every house of the republic and consume its very stones and timbers. In its recent convention in New York the reports of committees gave evidence, not only of appalling immoralities and frightful social conditions, but of heroic enterprise for the rescue of the degraded and the purification of the private and public life of the people. It was gratifying to learn that twenty-five Legislatures have enjoined instruction in the common schools in the scientific effects of alcohol and narcotics, and it is believed that New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee will soon sanction such instruction in their schools. Wisconsin was represented as fostering systematic fornication in its lumber regions, a stain that should be promptly obliterated by efficient legislation. To this work, beneficent, gracious, and patriotic, these Christian women are devoting their energies, treasure, and prayers; and the patriotism, religion, and philanthropy of the country must sustain and co-operate with them, to the end that the land may be cleansed of its filthiness and God have a name among us.

Mormonism in its polygamous aspect is doomed, but the doom awaits complete fulfillment. The cumulative Protestant argument against it; the Edmunds law enforced, especially against its chief men; and the decision of the Supreme Court of Utah dissolving the Mormon Church and escheating the personal property of the corporation to the government, have undermined the foundations of the offensive structure which, hearing a final blast from the Supreme Court of the United States, will, like the walls of Jericho, fall irrecoverably to the ground. It is noteworthy that the assault on Mormonism is because of its inherent and constitutional immorality. Protestantism denounces it because of its unrighteousness; the civil law excoriates it because of its baseness and disharmony with civil life; the courts are against it because it is a menace to national integrity and is guilty of high treason to humanity. Purified of its adulterous instincts, it may survive for a time as a system of religion and be permitted to exist, as Mohammedanism, Theosophism, Chinese paganism, and infidelity are permitted to express themselves, but its iniquities are so inseparable from its life that a few years more of purgatorial legislation will accomplish its extinction.

SPIRIT OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

REGARDING the higher periodicals of the day as exponents of the prevailing currents of thought in intellectual and religious circles, the Christian thinker is more than pleased to note that in treating of the varied phases of modern skepticism their tone is not now that of timid apologetics, but of bold aggression and abiding confidence in Christian truth. Not that the enemies of truth have abandoned the conflict, for Professors Kuenen and Siegfried are still trying to sweep away what the latter is pleased to designate "the thin cobwebs of a Mosaic original" for the Pentateuch. M. Renan is fresh in the field with his brilliant but absurdly fanciful and miscalled *History of the People of Israel*. Lawrence Oliphant, in his *Scientific Religion*, and other advocates of modern Occultism, are diffusing their fallacious and deistical, if not atheistical, ideas on "Spiritualism," "Theosophy," and "Esoteric Buddhism." C. E. Plumptre is assaulting teleology; and even the more or less orthodox Dr. Driver appears in his *Isiah* giving his support to the destructive methods of the "new criticism." But in these and all kindred productions of the day no really new hypotheses are broached. Some of them may contain variations in phases of the issues in controversy, but the hypotheses themselves have been proved to be without real grounds. In fact, many leading scientific and philosophical skeptics have been unconsciously led to conclusions which, when applied to the study of religion, have strengthened the Christian argument. It is therefore apparent that the wave of modern skepticism has lost most of its destructive force, and that Christian truth was never more strongly entrenched in the intellectual convictions of the Church than now. Never was the Church more confident of ultimate triumph; never was she more steadfast in her purpose to continue her conflict with error until her great Teacher shall be crowned Lord of all. And this confident and determined spirit, as intimated above, is strongly reflected in all our leading religious reviews and magazines.

The Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for October has: 1. "The First Methodist Conference West of the Alleghany Mountains;" 2. "The Problem of Methodism;" 3. "Baptism and its Design;" 4. "Volapük;" 5. "Are Faith-Cures Miraculous?" 6. "The Septuagint;" 7. "The Great Unthinkable Dogma;" 8. "Protestantism the Spirit of Christianity;" 9. "The Disciples and the Book;" 10. "Life and Genius of Sydney Lanier;" 11. "Dr. Steele's Fraternal Address;" 12. "Reminiscences of the Olden Times."

These are all ably written papers; but the second, on "The Problem of Methodism," by Dr. John E. Edwards, will command special attention, and probably provoke controversy among its readers. It is a caustic and defensive review of a volume by Dr. Borland, which book is itself a review of the differing opinions on the doctrine of Christian perfection

which are maintained among Methodists. Dr. Borland contends that, as Wesley says in his *Notes on the New Testament*, "To be born again is to be inwardly changed from all sin to all holiness." Planting himself on this definition of regeneration, Dr. Borland denies the necessity of "a second change," insisting that the maintenance of the state of "righteousness and true holiness," into which every one enters who is "created anew in Christ Jesus," "carries with it the title to and the moral fitness for the inheritance of the saints in light." Compelled to admit that Mr. Wesley in his earlier writings taught that without a "second change" pardoned and regenerated believers "must remain full of sin and death," Dr. Borland claims that in later life he held that the "regenerated believer is washed, is sanctified, his heart is purified by faith." He accounts for these contradictory theories of our founder by showing that, as a Churchman, he for a long time held to that clause of the ninth article of the Church of England which affirms that "this infection of nature doth remain in them that are regenerated." In this phrase he found a basis for the "second change" dogma. But he cut that "residue clause" out when he prepared the Articles of Religion for the Methodist Episcopal Church. And Dr. Borland asks, "Is there any rational or moral ground on which we can account for the unquestioned and unquestionable fact that he expurgated the residue clause . . . other than that he renounced and repudiated its doctrine?" After meeting sundry objections which the advocates of the second change will make to his statement of the content of regeneration, the author, as his reviewer shows, sums up his views, saying, "Regeneration is an *instantaneous* work, resulting in moral purity, while *perfection* is a *growth*, resulting in *maturity*." Dr. Borland's theory is as old as the "problem," which has been more or less obscured by the failure of many to interpret the language of Scripture in the light of the facts common to all Christian experience. Looking into the latter, one finds in regeneration the beginning of a new spiritual life, which in essence is "the love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost. This love dethrones selfism, expels its allied affections, and brings the will into subjection. Thus regeneration means the *cleansing* of the affections and the *sanctification* or setting apart of the man to the service of God. And since it implies justification it also includes the cleansing of the conscience from all guilt. This love is often at first only a feeble flame, the love of "a babe in Christ." But as faith takes in more and more of the deeper meaning of truth the flame brightens, the love becomes more and more potent in its appointed task of overcoming old habits of thought, feeling, and ethical action. Its victories beget rich experiences, which may become so decisive in their power as to amount to what many call a "second change;" but which are really nothing more than the fruits of fidelity to that maturing affection which is subject to a law of growth that will even in heaven impel it to reach forward to a still higher point of a development which can have no finality other than a point from which to rise still higher in the ecstasies and services of love. Taking these simple facts of experience for guides,

what need is there of looking at regeneration and Christian perfection as factors of an "insolvable problem?"

In "Baptism and its Design," Dr. G. H. Hayes finds a scriptural baptism to be a purification from sin by the agency of the Holy Ghost. Water baptism is therefore only a symbol of that purification, and since the Spirit is said to be "poured" or "sprinkled" on the subjects of his work, immersion in water cannot be the symbol of spiritual baptism. Dr. Hayes presses this point with a keen, merciless logic, which though it may not conquer Baptist prejudices, may keep many from being perplexed by Baptist teaching.

In "Volapük" the Rev. M. B. Chapman gives a lucid statement of M. Schleyer's scheme for constructing a new language, not to supersede the nine hundred languages now spoken, but only "to form a means of international communication, a common meeting-ground for the peoples of the earth." Volapük is simple in construction, has thirteen thousand words in its dictionary, and counts its disciples by thousands. Dr. Chapman is sanguine of its success.

In "The Septuagint—Its Critical Value," Dr. Wright gives his readers a scholarly article on the Septuagint, which, though not to be relied upon as a corrector of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, is yet of "great advantage in elucidating the text of the New."

Rev. W. J. Scott's paper on Sydney Lanier is a charming and appreciative critique upon a poet who, though prevented by the brevity of his career from fulfilling the highest promise of his richly cultivated genius, yet wrote enough to be enrolled among "the princes of song."

The Bibliotheca Sacra for October contains: 1. "The Divine Immanency;" 2. "The Economy of Pain;" 3. "Clement of Alexandria not an After-Death Probationist or Universalist;" 4. "The Oldest Book in the World;" 5. "Eschatology of the New England Divines;" 6. "Music and Christian Education;" 7. "Guilt;" 8. "Critical Note—Bethsaida." In the first of these papers Dr. James Douglas treats with rare ability of the relation of the divine immanency to the miracles of Christ. Rejecting the old definition of Christian apologetics, that "a miracle is the suspension of the laws of nature," and accepting "the dictum of modern science, that natural laws are the divine action," he claims that it was not by a suspension but by an intensification of the laws and forces of nature that Christ's miracles were produced. A brief analysis of the miracles leads him to his definition, that "the miracles of Christ were a new mode of the divine action in nature, revealing the divine presence and power. They were signs of a present God not far off, but is "that power in nature which can change the operations of nature at his own pleasure." All this is well and forcibly put, but one wishes that in his analysis of the miracle at Cana and of the raising of Lazarus the doctor had more fully established his theory that Christ's miracles were produced by an *intensification* of the laws and forces of nature. It is not apparent

that there is any force either in water or in a dead body which by *intensification* could cause the former to become wine, or in the latter could cause its reanimation by the departed spirit. Both acts certainly proved the power of our Lord to change the operations of nature, but that he did so in these cases by intensification of existing forces is, so far as we can see, "not proven." But the doctor speaks truly in saying of all Christ's miracles that their highest significance is, that "they were signs of his true work and mission of spiritual healing." And "the best proof of Christianity is in his teachings, character, and life." In the "Economy of Pain" Dr. Hayman concludes a series of thoughtful and suggestive papers on the question of human suffering, which, after all that can be written upon it, will still remain an inscrutable mystery. In this article the uses and lessons of pain, especially its place in the moral government of God, are very ably if not always satisfactorily treated. Dr. William De Loss Love, in a paper showing considerable research, attempts to defend Clement of Alexandria from the assertion of "New Departure" controversialists and others, that Clement was an after-death probationist and Universalist. His success is scarcely complete, seeing that, despite his interpretative comments on cited passages, one cannot very well avoid the conclusion that Clement's theory of the continuance of the Redeemer's work after this life does involve at least the possibility that there may be, as he says, "ways for purification and repentance after death." But Clement's opinion weighs lightly when placed in the scale against Christ's own words. "The Oldest Book in the World," a translation, by Professor Osgood, of the French version of the *Papyrus Priise*, by M. Philippe Verrey, is both a "literary curiosity" and an important contribution to human history. Distinguished Egyptologists accept it as the oldest book now extant in the world. It professes to have been written in Egypt 2000 B. C., and treats of religion, ethics, and society in Egypt before that remote period. It was obtained from excavations in the necropolis of Thebes. It unveils a very highly matured civilization existing in that country three thousand years before Christ, a period in which "Egypt was best governed and at the highest point of internal prosperity." Though not purely monotheistic, it yet then had "a far purer system of religious belief and a nobler conception of the Supreme Being than heathen Greece and Rome, a few centuries later, ever had." Its maxims are remarkably similar to those found in the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, and "are nearer the teachings of the Bible as to God and morality than to the teachers of Greece and Rome, or to Confucius and Buddha." Granting its genuineness, as many leading Egyptologists do, it sheds a light on the advanced condition of society in Egypt before Abraham lived, which revolutionizes one's conceptions concerning human progress in those early days in the life of humanity.

The *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for October contains :
1. "Charles Darwin;" 2. "The Witness of the Spirit;" 3. "An Analysis of Romans ix-xi;" 4. "The Theology of St. John;" 5. "The Ascension

of Isaiah;" 6. "An Examination of Determinism;" 7. "The History of Joseph;" 8. "Modern Occultism and Scientific Religion;" 9. "The Temptation of the Church;" 10. "History: a Demonstration under the Moral Law." In the first of these papers J. L. Morrow writes approvingly of the life and letters of Darwin as furnishing ample materials for forming a true conception of the man and his life-work. He shows how Darwin's studies had a materializing effect upon his mind, effacing the spiritual thoughts of his childhood and blinding him to every thing but matter; living among things lower than himself, he became like them in that his spiritual nature was stricken with atrophy. His teaching, Mr. Morrow claims with truth, is adverse to spiritual thought and feeling. In "The Witness of the Spirit," by B. C. Caffin, we have a forcible delineation of the Holy Spirit's threefold witness—in the Scriptures, in the lives of Christians, in the individual soul. The doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit to the sonship of the believer is clearly and beautifully presented, as is also the gift of power which is evidence of the presence of the Spirit in the soul. "An Analysis of Romans 9-11," is expository and exegetical, touching with a skillful pen the eternal question of "the compatibility of free will in the creature with the divine sovereignty." "The Theology of St. John," by Dr. P. J. Gloag, is a luminous critical synopsis of the theology taught by St. John in his writings. The characteristic of John's theology is its subjectiveness; it is the theology of the heart, combining simplicity of style with profundity of thought. It is not argumentative, like Paul's, but contemplative. Its view-point is not the sinfulness of man, as Paul's was, but the love of God, as seen in the incarnation of the divine Logos. Hence its key-note is the doctrine of the Logos, or the Word, as the manifestation of the divine reason. John did not derive the term Logos from Philo, the Jewish philosopher, as some assert, but from the Old Testament. He grounds his theology on the incarnation and on the atoning sufferings of the Logos. He traces human redemption to the Father's love seeking to restore humanity to its proper harmonious relation to himself. In John's theology faith has the same importance as in St. Paul's. The agency of the Holy Ghost in human redemption is made distinctly prominent, and he assigns a marked pre-eminence to love as the essence of the spiritual life which proceeds from the Holy Spirit. He demands of believers hatred to Antichrist, which embodies itself in the world, and which is dominated by Satan, whose ultimate overthrow he describes in his mystic Apocalypse. His eschatology is brought out chiefly in the latter, and is unmistakably clear as to human destiny. To fully understand St. John one must be spiritually minded, since he speaks more to the loving heart than to the critical intellect. "The Ascension of Isaiah" is a sketch of an ancient apocryphal book, purporting to be a history of Isaiah's martyrdom, etc., composed partly at the end of the first Christian century and partly in the second. It was known until the fifth century, when it almost disappeared from notice, until accidentally re-discovered by Richard Laurence, Archbishop of Cashel, in 1819. It treats mainly of the vision and martyrdom of the prophet Isaiah. It

is chiefly interesting to us because its rejection from the canon is, says our reviewer, a standing witness of the care taken in the early Church to confine the books of Scripture to those whose inspiration was approved by sufficient testimony.

The *North American Review* for November contains: 1. "For Whom Shall We Vote?" 2. "Camp-Fires of the G. A. R.;" 3. "Rome or Reason;" 4. "Yellow Fever and Its Prevention;" 5. "The Fast Set at Harvard;" 6. "Wall Street;" 7. "Catholicism and the Public Schools." Of these papers "The Fast Set at Harvard," signed Aleck Quest, will attract the attention of parents having sons in the university, and of all serious-minded men interested in our educational institutions. Of the two thousand students at Harvard this writer says that "perhaps a majority of them are quiet fellows." Most of the remainder drink, play, and get into reprehensible scrapes; one man in every twenty comprise what he calls a "fast set," who play poker, bet, drink, and revel in other degrading vices. He thinks the president, faculty, and overseers cannot easily remedy this state of things, though an aroused college sentiment might effect a reform. What the authorities do to arouse that sentiment he does not say; but surely, if it be true that such a "fast set" is tolerated there, religious men will be slow to place their sons within reach of such "fast" associations. Harvard cannot afford to tolerate them, either in its societies or in its classes. But judging by the spirit of this article, and by the testimony of some Harvard men, we incline to the opinion that its writer deals in hyperbole. Possibly he is a "sore-head." In "Wall Street" Brayton Ives gives a somewhat rose-colored view of Wall street and its methods, making it appear that, despite its speculative character, it is not quite so bad as it is commonly painted, and that it is indispensable to the financial interests of the country. Yet his own admissions show that its leading speculators do not give much heed to the law of love to one's neighbor in their operations. In "Catholicism and the Public Schools," Gail Hamilton is vivacious and vigorous, as she always is, but she evidently mistakes the true issue involved in the school question. She regards the hostility of the Catholic priesthood to our public school system as having its origin in the conscience of the Catholic laity. As a matter of fact, the great body of that people have few if any conscientious scruples against sending their children to the public schools. This has been shown by their opposition to the creation of parochial schools, and by the fact that many of them still persist in sending their children to the public schools. No, it is not lay Catholics but the priests who lead the fight against the public school system. Hence, even where parochial schools exist, they, as in Boston, mendaciously seek to say what books and teachers shall be permitted in the public schools to Protestant children. And even those priests are guided more by the policy of their anti-American Church than by conscience. They aim at State support for their own schools; and, despite Gail Hamilton's flippant demand that their dictum as to school-books, etc., shall be yielded to, we think the

time has come for every true American to separate the school question from party politics, and, while permitting parochial schools, to unite all parties in bidding those slaves of the Vatican to keep their hands off our school system, which is essential to the prosperity and perpetuity of our political system. Rome must not be permitted to rule in America, because her rule is the synonym of ruin !

The *Presbyterian Review* for October has: 1. "The Influence of Paganism on Post-Apostolic Christianity;" 2. The "Impeccability of Christ;" 3. "Charles Darwin's Religious Life—A Study in Spiritual Biography;" 4. "The Two Isaiahs, the Real and the Imaginary;" 5. "General Synod of the Reformed (Dutch) Church." Dr. George T. Purves in the first of these articles sketches with a master's hand the influences of pagan thought, pagan philosophy, and pagan society on the Church in the age next succeeding the apostolic. Having evidently studied the writers of the period, he may be accepted as an authority when he says, that "the mingling of paganism with post-apostolic Christianity was a necessary first stage in the education of the Gentile world in the doctrines of the Gospel. If paganism defiled Christianity, Christianity regenerated paganism. . . . It was inevitable that the intellectual apprehension of the Gospel by the world should at first be faulty and partial. But the teaching of the Hebrew apostles was destined to lift the whole world up to their own clear knowledge of God and his salvation." The second paper, on "The Impeccability of Christ," by Dr. William G. T. Shedd, is characterized by clearness of statement and much discriminative thoughtfulness. Its key-note is, that "Christ's person being constituted of two natures, one divine and the other human," the former is "both non-temptable and impeccable. . . . The human nature, on the contrary, is both temptable and peccable." Yet since his divine nature controlled the human, it "could not innocently and righteously leave the human nature to its own finiteness." Consequently, Christ, while "having a peccable nature in his constitution, was an impeccable person. Impeccability characterizes the God-man as a totality, while peccability is a property of his humanity." This theory is very ingeniously and forcibly reasoned upon, but when duly weighed one finds in it little else than a claim that in his human nature our Lord was *theoretically* but not actually peccable. If he could not sin he was assuredly as impeccable in his human as in his divine nature. But, despite this explanation, which does not explain, the paper deserves consideration because of its admirable thoughts on temptation and the power of divine grace to strengthen the human will. In "Charles Darwin's Religious Life" Professor B. B. Warfield has, from the materials found in "Darwin's Life and Letters," by his son, constructed a history of the famous naturalist's *inner* life; and a sad history it is, showing the descent of a naturally noble nature from its early beliefs in Christian truth, through a cold Theism down to the gloomy depths of a rayless Agnosticism. If evolution implies development of the lowest in the direction of the highest, then its greatest advocate, though ethically an admirable char-

acter, was not in his *spiritual* nature an evolutionist. Instead of ascending spiritually he degenerated. "The Two Isaiahs" is a very able review by Principal George C. M. Douglas of Cheyne's *Prophecies of Isaiah* and Dr. Driver's *Isaiah: His Life and Times, and the Writings which Bear his Name*. It is well known that recent rationalistic writers, following some German scholars of the last century, have claimed that the Isaiah who wrote the first thirty-nine chapters of the book bearing his name could not have written the remainder, because the historic events it records occurred subsequently to his death, and because its style differs greatly from that of the previous chapters. Hence they contend for two Isaiahs. The arguments by which this claim is supported are thoroughly and effectually sifted by Dr. Douglas, and shown to be groundless. The prophetic gifts of Isaiah enabled him to predict things and characters he did not live to behold in person; and his grand conceptions of Israel's assured deliverance from captivity, with his foresight of the coming Christ, fully account for the superior elevation and eloquence of his diction in the later chapters of his book. Dr. Douglas has evidently no sympathy with the novelties of the new critical school which vainly strives to overthrow the old beliefs of the Church concerning the sacred record.

The Old Testament Student with New Testament Supplement for November contains: 1. Editorial; 2. "Weber on the Eschatology of the Talmud;" 3. "The Story of Samson;" 4. "The Assyrian King Asurbanipal;" 5. "Old Testament Word Studies—Moral Good;" 6. "Biblical Doctrine of Inspiration;" 7. "Synopsis of Important (Review) Articles;" 8. "New Testament Study, No. 9—"The Parables of the Kingdom."—*Canadian Methodist Magazine* has: 1. "Landmarks of History;" 2. "Round About England (No. 5);" 3. "Vagabond Vignettes;" 4. "In Search of the Picturesque;" 5. "A Word for Classical Studies;" 6. "Forty Years with the Sioux;" 7. "A Sealing Adventure;" 8. "The Lost Silver of Briffault;" 9. "The Higher Life;" 10. "Rome Within Rome;" 11. "An Historic Church;" 12. "Some Summer American Resorts."—*Harper's Magazine* for November, besides its usual quantum of interesting fiction, has the following finely illustrated instructive articles: 1. "The Lower St. Lawrence;" 2. "A Museum of the History of Paris;" 3. "Elk-Hunting in the Rocky Mountains;" 4. "Boats on the Tagus;" 5. "The New York Real Estate Exchange;" 6. "Our Journey to the Hebrides," etc.—*The Historical and Genealogical Register* for October contains: 1. "Memoir of Israel Ward Andrews, D.D., LL.D.," with steel portrait; 2. "The Marietta Colony of 1788;" 3. "Alumni of William and Mary College who have Held Official Positions;" 4. "Soldiers of King Philip's War;" 5. "Place Index to the Register;" 6. "Inscriptions in Colchester Burying Ground;" 7. "The Tradition of Micah Rood;" 8. "Genealogical Gleanings in England;" 9. "Rendezvous of the Dorchester Colony;" 10. "Notes and Queries;" 11. "Societies and Their Proceedings;" 12. "Necrology of the New England Historic Genealogical Society."

BOOKS: CRITIQUES AND NOTICES.

OF the many good books referred to in this issue, the following will be especially prized if purchased: *The Chief Periods of European History*, by Prof. Edward A. Freeman; *Martin Luther*, by Peter Bayne, LL.D.; *Four Centuries of Silence*, by the Rev. R. A. Redford; and *Faith Made Easy*, by James H. Potts, D.D.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Faith Made Easy: or, What to Believe, and Why. A Popular Statement of the Doctrines and Evidences of Christianity in the Light of Modern Research and Sound Biblical Interpretation. By JAMES H. POTTS, M.A., D.D. 8vo, pp. 546. Cincinnati: Craunton & Stowe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Price, cloth, \$2 50.

OF the many books issued from the religious press of the country, few are so well adjusted to the modern spectacle of agnosticism in collision with faith, or so adroitly uncover the strategic positions and the infirm methods of assault on one side, or so comprehensively proclaim the truth, with its auxiliary supports, on the other, as this substantial octavo from one of the gifted writers of Methodism. Entirely free from the partisanship of an advocate, and unbiased in thought and expression, only as truth may bias the mind, he states clearly what should be believed respecting Christianity, enforcing the duty by rational considerations and arguments drawn from the truth to be believed. Pronouncing theological ideas for the common people, he avoids the technism of theology, but writes with all the strength and penetration of the profound theologian, all the beauty and elegance of the accomplished penman, and all the faith and courage of a devout Christian, furnishing an unanswerable reason for receiving the entire system of Christianity into the heart and life. Avoiding also the customary theological arrangement of subjects embraced in the great theme, and omitting the discussion of non-essential doctrines, together with controversies respecting the same, he has produced a book every page of which is worth reading because inspired by the spirit of the religion whose character and claims he aims to set forth. Thus viewed and understood, if read it will strengthen the faith of the Christian, convince and arouse the unregenerated, and instruct and admonish, if it does not overwhelm and rescue, the doubter in his darkness and sin.

Fully stating what to believe concerning the Bible, the Deity, redemption, prayer, the Sabbath, the Church, Christian duties and graces, the future state, and unbelief, it is made clear what not to believe, not so much by a direct statement and denunciation of error as by the transparent exhibition of truth, in whose presence error cannot abide. In the presentation of one side, the truth-side, of Christianity, the error side stands out to view by implication, but soon departs loaded down with suspicions and vagaries.

While, as a whole, the book is so excellent in its teachings and so well adapted to counteract the mischievous tendencies of unbelief, it may seem puerile to note that too much stress is laid upon miracles as credentials of Christianity, and a too brief exposition is given of the character and function of the Church, though the author drives a nail in a sure place when he says "that no one body of Christians has the right to set up as the only true Church." Space had not been wasted or unwisely occupied had the author amplified the law of prayer, the chief issue on the subject of prayer, or injected a little braver theology in the section on atonement, though when he says, "The atonement is necessary because man is unable to atone for himself," he lays the foundation for a complete Arminian superstructure of soteriology. Passing over these discoveries, not mentioned as of the nature of criticism, but as suggestive only of revised thought in the future, we urge the placing of the work in the hands of laymen for their instruction and strength, and of the clergy that they may see what popular forms divine truths may be made to take, and thereby learn the lesson of increased usefulness in preaching the Gospel to the masses.

Man a Revelation of God. By REV. G. E. ACKERMAN, A.M., M.D., D.D., Author of *Researches in Philosophy*, Member of the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, Associate in the Philosophical Society of Great Britain, etc. 12mo, pp. 396. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Craunston & Stowe. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

Among the many results of the hard thinking of these times is now and then from some quarter a new proof of the existence, or of the attributes, of God, or a reconstruction of familiar lines of argument, with magnetic exhortation in its behalf. The danger of the hour is not from atheistic heaven, which is hypocrisy, but in the tendency to obscure the ground of faith in the divine administration and purpose respecting the world. To make patent the fact of the divine presence and order in human history; to recover the lost forms of faith in divine revelation and stimulate inquiry into its integrity and value; and to demonstrate from man himself the reign of the Supreme Power in his individual development, is not only an established but also a satisfactory and conclusive method of winning recognition of the theistic principle as the ultimate factor of government and the genesis of all existence. In some measure Dr. Ackerman accomplishes this end, as he carefully, scientifically, and theologically analyzes and interprets the physical, intellectual, moral, and regenerated capacities and achievements of man in his civilized and Christianized attainment and dominion. After many years of patient reading and a thoughtful discrimination of what was read, and some original exploration and comparison on his own account, the author presents this work as an additional evidence of the divine origin of man, and, reflexively, of the human manifestation of God. Other works treat of God in nature, God in history, God in the Bible, but this work confines itself to an elaboration of God in man; the prominent facts of man's origin, character, and activity being turned into simple but effective arguments, where the details, sometimes too minutely pointed out, are so used in the construction of a complex defense of the main

position as to satisfy the average mind of its strength and truthfulness. In this view of the subject the book has its mission, and, we are happy to state, is fulfilling it, in the judgment of those who are observers of its influence in the realm of the earnest seekers after the best expression of truth.

Bible Studies from the Old and New Testaments. Covering the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1889. By GEORGE F. PENTECOST, D.D., Author of "*In the Volume of the Book*," "*Out of Egypt*," etc. 16mo, pp. 402. New York and Chicago: A. S. Barnes & Co. Strong paper cover, 50 cents.

Gospel Sermons. By JAMES MCCOSH, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Ex-President of Princeton College, Author of "*Method of Divine Government*," "*Intuitions of the Mind Inductively Examined*," etc. 12mo, pp. 336. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

Studies in the Book of Acts. By J. WILLIAMS, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Connecticut. 8vo, pp. 178. New York: Thomas Whittaker. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

The Sermon Bible. Genesis to 2 Samuel. 12mo, pp. 500. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

Dr. Pentecost has produced a superior commentary, both as to its literary form and the exhibition of the spiritual meaning of the Scriptures within the limits of the Sunday-school lessons.

Dr. McCosh is not more of a philosopher than preacher. He has studied the Scriptures perhaps more than the speculative questions of evolution and intuition, embodying in this treatise the results of his pulpit preparations for a life-time. It is gratifying to turn to these pages as they reflect the sober thought of a great thinker, and the transparent expression of a devout and humble mind. Though the sermons are less doctrinal than didactic, they are upon themes of great interest to the Christian, and, for the most part, are quite in harmony with the Arminian thought of these days. In "*The Sifting of Peter*," the preacher had the opportunity of investing the discourse with a Calvinistic halo, but he did not avail himself of it. The truth is, that this book is the final theological utterance of the great divine, and he seems in it to have indirectly recorded himself against those ultra forms of thought that once dominated the Princeton realm. We welcome these sermons as a good exponent of perhaps unconscious Arminian influence in the stronghold of a venerable but antiquated theology.

Interpreting *The Acts of the Apostles* as a record of missionary heroism and success, Dr. Williams has amplified and illuminated it by a scholarly analysis of its contents, and in a manner most refreshing and fascinating. No uninspired history of missionary achievement equals Luke's account of the struggles and triumphs of the early Church, and this book greatly assists in an appreciation of the magnitude of the apostolic labors and the magnificence of their results.

It is not clear to us that *The Sermon Bible*, made up of fragments of sermons or paragraphs of opinions from eminent divines, has a special function or will be of any value either to the ministry or laity; we therefore consign it to the "tomb of the Capulets."

The Tabernacle of Israel in the Desert. A Companion Volume to the Portfolio of Plates, explanatory of the Particulars, with Detailed Plans and Drawings, and Letter-Press Descriptions. By JAMES STRONG, S.T.D., LL.D. Quarto, pp. 106. Providence, R. I.: Harris, Jones, & Co. Price, \$5.

Until the reader shall have mastered this work he can have no just conception of the difficulties of the subject, or of the erudition, patience, skill, and the scholarly searching and application required to overcome them. The first impression that the volume makes upon the student is of the exhaustless ability of the distinguished author, and of the final solution of the problems that have perplexed the biblical inquirer for ages. With giving the history of the tabernacle, and that incompletely, most writers, Jewish as well as Christian, have been satisfied; but Dr. Strong, like an architect, here presents its structure, elucidating and vindicating the fabric and mode of combination in minute detail, so that it can be perfectly reconstructed from these specifications. And he has carefully and cautiously interpreted its symbolism, having found a "functional import" in the several apartments, which is in entire harmony with its sacred design and with the principles of religion. Accompanying the volume of letter-press are six magnificent colored lithographs, each 30x42 inches, representing the ground plan of the Tabernacle, front views, furniture, vestments, etc., so that the text, as one reads it, will have illustration and verification in these pictures, which, without the book, almost declare the truth themselves. As the treatise is original, it is refreshing; as it is the product of a reputable scholar, traveler, and thinker, it may be accepted as trustworthy in detail, and reliable as a whole; as no other work equals it in breadth, or so closely conforms to the scriptural account of the tabernacle, it must at once supplant all others; and as the solution of the enigma is complete and unanswerable the approval of the learned world may be anticipated for it in advance, while the individual examiner of the solution will breathe easily, and go on to further conquests in the field of biblical history.

The Book of Jubilees. Translated from the Ethiopic. By Rev. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Ph.D., Professor in Capitol University, Columbus, Ohio. 8vo, pp. 131. Oberlin, Ohio: E. J. Goodrich. Price, cloth, \$1.

Here is an historic curiosity, a work handed down from the Hebrew, through the Greek and Ethiopic, from the first century of the Christian era. The translator describes it as an haggadic commentary on portions of Genesis and Exodus, and a representative example of the manner in which the learned contemporaries of Christ perverted biblical books for their own purpose. In contents it exhibits the Judaic spirit and tendency of New Testament times, or the nomistic principle of Jewish theology in opposition to the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, giving us a glimpse of the conflicts of the Christian preachers with the Judaizing teachers in those days of religious controversy. In addition to its corroboration of Moses, it contains stories and fables concerning the fathers in Israel, and explains events by circumstances and a detail of processes and methods that discredit the events themselves. Still, the

scholar should carefully study this book, and, as this translation is superior to any extant, one may read it with all confidence and be able to judge of the value of the original document.

ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE.

The Evolution of Episcopacy and Organic Methodism. By Rev. THOMAS B. NEELY, Ph.D., D.D., Author of "*Young Workers in the Church*," "*The Church Lyceum*," "*Parliamentary Practice*," etc. 12mo, pp. 448. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

Owing to the supercilious attitude of so-called Churchmen who worship their walls of partition, and an alleged but quiescent tendency to third-orderism in the Methodist Episcopal Church, a restatement of the *doctrine* of the Church respecting episcopacy is opportune, both to enlighten the uninformed, to check the aggressive spirit of those in sympathy with an ecclesiastical hierarchy, and to settle once for all the position of the Church before the world on a subject that really troubles our neighbors more than ourselves. Having accomplished these ends in his book, Dr. Neely may be regarded as an exponent of the Methodist stand-point of episcopal history and prerogative, and until his facts are invalidated his conclusions must pass in all Church circles as final and authoritative. In its Methodist aspect, episcopacy is the result of an evolution that, commencing with the early Christian Church, has expressed itself in changes in every episcopal organization since that period. We hold it to be incontrovertible that the providential origin of an institution, or system, or Church is as authentic and divine as its more immediate scriptural authorization and induction into position and influence. Our episcopacy, as providential in origin as the Christian Church itself, makes no apology for its existence to those who, with false dates and stained robes, would ally themselves by a chronological chain with the apostles. To us the providence of our history is more important than the perishable beauty of a broken chain upon whose supposed strength Churchmen depend for Churchship. Disputing the ecclesiastical chronology of the Church of England, on which the false claim of apostolical succession is made to rest, it is clear to those who are familiar with Church history that our Methodist episcopacy is in line with the apostolic beginnings, of which, indeed, it is the final evolution. With historic data at hand, Dr. Neely, after considering the simple forms of authority in the early Christian Church, exhibits the modification of episcopal function in the Church of England after the Protestant Reformation, following it with Mr. Wesley's variant view of that function, which passed over into American Methodism as its presiding element, and as the standard of episcopal character and life. In this evolution the author makes free use of authorities in the Church of England—as the Rev. Edwin Hatch, Dean Stanley, Archdeacon Farrar, and obtains a stronger affidavit from Bishop Onderdonk of the diocese of Pennsylvania—who on the questions at issue

are as affirmative as either Mr. Wesley or Francis Asbury. Historically, Dr. Neely's argument is unanswerable, and, as the key to the controversy is history, it should end with the summoned testimony of history. While the book openly, though incidentally, exposes the sepulchral character of the dogma of apostolical succession, its primary and ultimate purpose is the vindication of Methodist episcopacy, both as to its history and character, the author maintaining with characteristic vigor that the third-order dogma is foreign to all Methodist teaching and usage, and to be reprobated as the offspring of the hierarchical mind.

Standing on this impregnable conclusion, he readily, but perhaps with less animation of style, since it is unnecessary, establishes the validity of Methodist ordinations, and the propriety and legitimacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In examining this able work it has occurred to us more than once that, instead of explaining Mr. Wesley's high-handed departures, and legally and historically upholding our episcopacy as though it needed defense, the burden of history should be shifted to the Church of England, and Henry VIII. should be vindicated by Dean Bradley, or by next year's Lambeth Conference. For the present we rest the case with the author's masterful exposition of it.

The People's History of Presbyterianism in All Ages. By ROBERT P. KERR, D.D., Author of *Presbyterianism for the People*. 12mo, pp. 284. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Price, cloth, \$1 25.

The frontispiece is a picture of Calvin; the spirit of the book is in favor of the Presbyterian principle; and the outlook is one of complete domination of that principle in the church-world. Presbyterianism has written a long and eventful history. It has related itself to civil government, affected the domestic affairs of nearly all countries on the globe, and influenced the lives and destinies of many millions of the race. For the people's sake it deserves a larger record, a more comprehensive development of its progress, and a broader philosophic account of its results than is here afforded. The author's apology, that the masses have not the time to read a more elaborate work, will hardly avail in this case. Taking it, however, as we have it, the Presbyterian reader should be satisfied with the showing of his denomination in the moral conflict of the world, for, even if now and then extravagant in claim, it is a sincere description of the Presbyterian factor in human history. All denominations, indeed, are sharers of the heroism, integrity, and achievements of the Church that, however erroneous in some of its staple doctrines, has stood for truth, and sanctified its faith by its blood. All Christians may profitably study these pages, and rejoice in the steadfastness of a people who, holding to the doctrine of decrees, have not been idle in the matter of evangelizing the world. So far as the author has occasion to refer to the Methodist Episcopal Church he is in unconscious error, the correction of which is our duty. Defining Presbyterianism as "spiritual republicanism," he says (p. 22) it is the "opposite of Episcopacy." Episcopacy, he intimates, is an oligarchical form of government, which, strictly and rigidly maintained by the Prot-

estant Episcopal Church, is becoming quiescent in the Methodist Episcopal Church. "The principle of self-government," he says, "has saturated almost the entire body;" that is, the Presbyterian principle of republicanism has "saturated" the Methodist Episcopal principle of oligarchy, and modified it into harmony with the spirit of the age! It is well known that Arminianism has "saturated" Calvinism until it is quiescent, if not non-existent, and if in return the republicanism of the old Church has molded Methodism into democratic form we should be grateful; but we have not so read history, and do not interpret episcopacy as oligarchical. There is an oligarchical episcopacy, but it is not Methodist episcopacy, which, by its denial of a third order for its incumbents, is as democratic as Church rulership represented by an order or office can well be. Space does not permit us to exhibit republicanism in Methodism; it is sufficient here to emphasize its presence and authority, not as derived from the Presbyterian leaven, but as original in its constitution, and as the providential birth-mark of its history. On page 239 the author has the courage to represent that the Presbyterians outnumber, both in communicants and adherents, any other Protestant denomination in the world! This may be so, but who believes it? In our library this book shall stand beside Stevens's *History of Methodism*, the contrast of the two denominations suggesting itself to us every morning by the size of the respective histories.

The Nonuch Professor in his Meridian Splendor; or, The Singular Actions of Sanctified Christians. By the Rev. WILLIAM SECKER, Minister of All-Hallows Church, Londonwall. With an Introduction by Rev. T. L. CUYLER, D.D. 16mo, pp. 367. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$1 25.

This is one of those books, more rare in other denominations than among Methodists, intended to assist the Christian in the attainment of all the possibilities of grace. Rich in thought, sweet and holy in the affectional spirit, chaste and devout in expression, it constitutes a "breviary of religion" suitable for use by all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. In showing that the Christian should do more than others, and how he may do more than others, it becomes a manual of practical godliness, stimulating in its suggestions, and educational in its teachings. It makes not against it that it is not a new book, nor that its style is less modern than the book of yesterday, nor that the title is almost meaningless; for its atmosphere is holiness, its thunder is that of Sinai, its tenderness that of Gethsemane, its redemption that of Calvary, its hope an apocalypse. Who reads it will be wiser; who observes it will be holier.

PHILOSOPHY, METAPHYSICS, AND GENERAL SCIENCE.

Principles of the Economic Philosophy of Society, Government, and Industry. By VAN BUREN DENSLOW, LL.D. 8vo, pp. 782. New York: Cassel & Company. Price, cloth, \$3.

The day is prolific of treatises on economics, some of them superficial and written from a political bias, intending to affect pending elections, while

others, ignoring the expediencies of parties and the selfishness of class interests, grapple with rigid social conditions, expound the laws of trade, declare an international code of procedure, and indicate the legislation that, conserving national sovereignty, will at the same time contribute to the world's peace, prosperity, and happiness. Dr. Denslow's masterly work belongs to the latter class of recent issues, and is therefore a book for statesmen, and all others who, irrespective of prior views or affiliations, desire to grasp the subject in its width, compass, and unfoldings. There is no phase of the economic problem, historical, philosophical, social, political, and moral, that has escaped the attention of the patient and thoughtful author; and there are no facts, or statistics, or principles, or state or national laws bearing upon any particular phase that seemingly have not been appropriated or consulted by this impartial historian of the subject.

It is not to be expected, however, that whatever may be the philosophy of man's temporal condition, and whatever lessons history infallibly teaches respecting that condition, all readers will agree with the author, either as to the facts quoted or the inferences they justify. As he alludes to "fiat money," supports the principle of "protection," holds up capital as an emancipator, and objects to socialistic theories concerning the American railway system, he may be judged harshly, and, notwithstanding the statesmanship of his presentation, be pronounced illogical in logic and untrue to the nature of things. All that may be required of him is that his facts be genuine, and, as they were obtained from documents accessible to all, of this no suspicion can be raised except by those who disagree with the stubborn report of history. With the theory of Adam Smith, Malthus's so-called law, John Stuart Mill's *a priori* interpretation, and a theoretical or metaphysical exposition of economic life, he has little sympathy; but with the facts pertaining to wealth, land, labor, taxation, values, and prices, and the laws governing them, he is in perfect harmony, and is as instructive as he is correct. Its facts respected and its laws observed, the individual will triumph over his temporal obstacles, and the nation will evolve into a solid and exemplary perpetuity.

Philosophia Ultima; or, Science of the Sciences. Vol. I. An Historical and Critical Introduction to the Final Philosophy as Issuing from the Harmony of Science and Religion. By CHARLES WOODRUFF SHIELDS, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Princeton College. Third Edition, Abridged and Revised. 8vo, pp. 419. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Only a thinker of as large ability as the reputed author of this volume would be justified in undertaking to cover the breach, long existing and still wide and deep, between such antagonists as science and religion. Though his task was great he has performed it with both the patience and labor it imposed, and satisfied at least the parties of one side to the great conflict. He very properly first submits, not only the attitude of the philosophical parties in the contest, but the parties themselves, such as infidels, sciolists, dogmatists, apologists, and eclectics, clearly pointing out the indifferentism, eclecticism, and historical causes of the strained

relations between them. As a preliminary statement, part first is valuable, and prepares the reader for the profounder discussion of the philosophical theory of the harmony of science and religion. The positive philosophy, or theory of nescience as ignoring revelation, of which Auguste Comte was the exponent, he rejects; the absolute philosophy, or theory of omniscience as superseding revelation, of which Sir William Hamilton was the chief expositor, he likewise puts aside; but the final philosophy, or the theory of perfectible science as concurring with revelation, is that form of thought upon which in his judgment harmony is predicable and certain of fulfillment. Another volume elaborating the final theory will soon appear, when the student may possess a philosophic solution of a difference that long since should have disappeared, because truth is one and fraternal.

The Virtues and their Reasons. A System of Ethics for Society and Schools. By AUSTIN BIERBOWER, Author of *The Morals of Christ*. 12mo, pp. 294. Chicago: George Sherwood & Co. Cloth, \$1.50.

As a text-book on ethics for schools, it is admirably arranged and comprehensive in treatment, fulfilling the purpose of the author. It is specific in the discussion of duties regarding others, including kindness, beneficence, forgiveness, truth, honesty, patriotism, etc.; and it is emphatic in representing the duties regarding self, such as self-development, industry, self-support, self-control, temperance, self-respect, purity, and conscientiousness. Its definitions are philosophically accurate; its distinctions broad and clear; its logic conclusive; and the ethical content wholesome. Avoiding religious teaching *per se*, it may be perused with profit by Catholic, Jew, and Protestant; but a narrow mind, forgetting its design, may object to the absence of the religious spirit. This, however, is a commendatory feature. To the statement that the idea of right is that which men consider *best* for them we stoutly object, and the author acknowledges its insufficiency. Morality has a higher ground than utility. Still, if some men can be led into right-doing because of self-interest it will be a gain to the world; but the race needs higher teaching, and must act from loftier ethics.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

Patriotic Addresses, in America and England, from 1850 to 1885, on Slavery, The Civil War, and the Development of Civil Liberty in the United States. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. Edited, with a Review of Mr. Beecher's Personality and Influence in Public Affairs, by JOHN R. HOWARD. 8vo, pp. 857. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert. Price, cloth, \$2.75; half morocco, \$4.25.

Mr. Beecher was the largest American figure of his time. He was more than a religious preacher: he was an actor in the civil drama of his country. He was more than an orator: he was a writer of commanding force, and a thinker of the first magnitude. He was a citizen, an author, a teacher, an editor, a minister of the Gospel, a patriot, and the heroic

representative of American manliness and aspiration. With infirmities glaring enough to be seen, and compromising himself all too often by the exercise of an enlarged erratic tendency, he sometimes lost prestige when he might have retained it, and by a seeming vacillation in his faith alienated followers who otherwise would have adhered to him to the end. But his personality and great political influence, as well as the pre-eminence he occupied in the American pulpit, cannot soon be forgotten; nor should the republic be ungrateful enough to overlook his services in its behalf in the days of its peril and progress. He was the friend of humanity, the lover of the poor, the advocate of the slave, the terror of treason, and the embodiment of imperishable devotion to his country. The addresses here given represent him more as the patriotic speaker than the pulpit orator. In one he denounces slavery with all the wrath of fire; in another he portrays the evil of compromise of principle; here he defines the modes and duties of emancipation; there he emphasizes the conditions of a restored Union; and in all the undercurrent of a transparent loyalty is strong and impetuous. Fortunately, the addresses he delivered in England and Scotland during the American Rebellion, in which his courage is at the front, and which terrified the English throne, are here reproduced, giving the reader a glimpse of the greatness of the man in emergencies such as tested his fidelity to conviction, and his heroism in the presence of foes. While these addresses do not reveal all of Mr. Beecher's resources, they are the open door to his inner life, the true life of honor, patriotism, and morality, and as such must be prized by the American citizen and the uncritical Christian. Mr. Howard's review of Mr. Beecher's personality and political work is impartial and thorough, enabling us to understand the great preacher without asking very many questions, and, as it reveals him in his positive and negative aspects, we can see how human he was, and yet what a tower of humanity he also was as he stood among men. The publication of these addresses will revive the memory of his life, and preserve it over to the generations to come.

Martin Luther: His Life and Work. By PETER BAYNE, LL.D. In two volumes. 8vo. Vol. i, pp. 518; vol. ii, pp. 583. London, Paris, New York: Cassell & Co. Price, cloth, \$2 50 per volume.

At last a standard work on the divinely called German leader of the Protestant epoch in Europe has appeared, containing not only the biography of the reformer, but also an historical and, as it progresses, a philosophical portraiture of the great Reformation, with the causes that invoked it and the permanency of the work accomplished by it. Granting that other men, strong and true, assisted in the separation of more than one European people from the dominion of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, Luther was the genius of the movement, and intensified it by a personal force wanting in his associates and all other helpers. Without him the Reformation had not been; yet with him it was sometimes compromised, if not enfeebled, by a harshness of method and a narrowness of Scripture interpretation, as the ground of his independence, that repelled not a few of

the devoted adherents of the providential emancipation. In an estimate of that mighty revolution that threatened the overthrow of Catholic influence every-where, the infirmities of leadership must be forgotten in the magnificent courage of those at the front and their unchangeable purpose to prosecute the undertaking to completion. Whatever personal disqualifications one may discover in the lives of such men for such work, there is no wavering of faith, no vacillation of purpose, no uncertainty as to the result in their minds, or in those of their followers. The enthusiasm of the Reformation was a quenchless fire that consumed in its spread the opposition of the foe, and it never expired while its leader led or lived. Dr. Bayne, unlike Köstlin, D'Aubigné, Von Ranke, and other biographers, exalts Luther in his supervision of the movement until he stands out as the commanding general of a nation's army, or as a veritable pope of a new and prophetic-born Church. In this scheme of exaltation his coadjutors occupy subsidiary relations, and seem to accomplish less than other historians have attributed to them. As the one rises into conspicuous authority the others sink into commonplace, or assigned, positions. This distribution of influence is occasioned by the endeavor of the author to find the embodiment of the Protestant principle, and in none of his co-laborers is it so intensive and causative as in Luther. He is the Moses of the reform movement, eclipsing those nearest him and most serviceable to him.

Besides, these volumes are written with less respect to the Reformation than to the instrument of it, which accounts in part for the conspicuous position of the great leader. By this we do not mean that one will not understand the Reformation from the reading of these volumes—for, without assuming to be historical, it is essentially an analysis, keen and discriminating, of the epoch and the movement—but that the leader will seem greater than the event, because he is more prominently recognized by the author. But, as the history of the Reformation should be rewritten, and Luther's life and character have a new avowal and vindication, we indorse these volumes, commending them to Roman Catholics, whose abuse of their foe was never equaled except by the Jews in their denunciations of Jesus; to unbelievers, who confuse all religions into a mass of absurdities, and to Christians, who may see in the rise of the day-star of the Reformation the bidding of Providence, and who may hear the words of Luther the thunderous echo of a divine messenger, robed in the garments of freedom and dwelling in the mountains of holiness.

My Story of the War. A Woman's Narrative of Four Years' Personal Experience as Nurse in the Union Army, and in Relief Work at Home, in Hospitals, Camps, and at the Front, during the War of the Rebellion. With Anecdotes, Pathetic Incidents, and Thrilling Reminiscences, portraying the Lights and Shadows of Hospital Life and the Sanitary Service of the War. By MARY A. LIVERMORE. Superbly Illustrated with Portraits and numerous Full-page Engravings on Steel and Fine Chromo-Lithograph Plates. 8vo, pp. 700. Hartford, Conn.: A. D. Worthington & Co. Price, cloth, \$3 50.

The above description, taken from the title-page, accurately sets forth the purpose of this volume, but it should be added that so different is it from

any other record of the war, narrating experiences and phases of military life usually relegated to hospital statistics or omitted altogether, no one's history of the national struggle for existence can be considered complete without this superb addition to his library. Nor does it merely contain new experiences of a nurse; it is practically a new history of the great conflict: not a philosophic analysis of the causes that incited it, nor a technical report of its battles, nor an historian's methodical presentation of its progress; but a pathetic and yet virile revelation of the sufferings, hardships, and sacrifices of the men who ventured all for the country's safety and deliverance. It brings to light also the fact that without woman's co-operation, without her philanthropy and patriotism, without the uprising of the home against the rebellion, the victory over it would have been delayed, and perhaps never secured. To the heroic women of the land, as well as to the soldiers in the field and the statesmen at the head of affairs, does the united country owe an imperishable debt of gratitude and love. Mrs. Livermore writes as one speaking with authority. Intimately related to the Sanitary Commission, her husband a journalist, she herself a nurse in camp and on the field, having access to the official documents required to verify her statements, and personally acquainted with President Lincoln and the prominent generals of the war, besides having a thorough knowledge of the hospital service and of the Northern spirit of sympathy with the suffering, she was abundantly qualified to prepare the book now issued by the house herein named. On their own account the publishers have introduced many battle-flag plates into the volume, giving the reader an idea of the flags captured from the Confederates as well as of the flags that floated over and cheered the armies of the North. It is sufficient to say that he who is still interested in the method of his country's salvation from slavery and disunion will linger over these pages with tears and a renewed devotion to the cause of human liberty and progress.

The Chief Periods of European History. Six Lectures Read in the University of Oxford in Trinity Term, 1885. With an Essay on Greek Cities Under Roman Rule. By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M.A., Honorary D.C.L., and LL.D., Regius Professor of Modern History, Fellow of Oriel College, Honorary Fellow of Trinity College. 8vo, pp. 250. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, cloth, \$2 50.

While Europe may be observed with an intellectual opera-glass from many stand-points, the distinguished lecturer was fortunate in choosing the Roman power as the center of his inquiry, first considering Europe prior to Roman influence in its affairs, then recognizing the sovereignty of that influence, and afterward tracing its downfall and extinction. The student will be profoundly impressed with the contrast drawn between Roman pre-eminence in Lecture II and the Romeless world in Lecture VI, an illustration of the rise and fall of the greatest national power in history. As a repository of facts the book is superior and trustworthy; in the grouping of facts in their historical relations and in the political and moral lessons the events are made to teach, or at least suggest, the

author displays a high order of literary skill; in the clearness of his purpose and the orderly method of its development he equals Guizot, which is sufficient commendation; and in the recognition of other empires, with the elements of their strength, he is generous, yet withal critical, but ever true to the current of time. More of this kind of literature is coveted by students of historic phenomena.

The Story of Media, Babylon, and Persia. Including a Study of the Zend-Avesta, or Religion of Zoroaster, from the Fall of Nineveh to the Persian War. By ZÉNAÏDE A. RAGOZIN, Member of the "American Oriental Society;" of the "Société Ethnologique" of Paris; Associate of the "Victoria Institute," of London, etc. 12mo, pp. 447. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages (375-814). By EPHRAIM EMERTON, Ph.D., Professor of History in Harvard University. 16mo, pp. 268. Boston: Ginn & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.

Institutes of Christian History. An Introduction to Historic Reading and Study. By A. CLEVELAND COXE, Bishop of Western New York. 12mo, pp. 328. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

In the first of these books we have a compressed but elegantly written history of three great empires, with their wars and religions, that filled the eye of the world for many centuries. The chief events here detailed, commencing with the battle of Megiddo, B. C. 609, and ending with the battle of Marathon, B. C. 490, relate to the rise and development of the religion of Zoroaster and Aryan myths, of a series of migrations and the presence of foreign influence, of the old question of the "balance of power," transferred in modern times from Asia to Europe; of civil and foreign wars, and of the internal growth and decay of the capital cities of these kingdoms. The author is more than a compiler; he assimilates history into current form, and is entertaining and instructive.

Professor Emerton might have expanded his *Introduction* a hundred pages more without destroying its character or interfering with his plan. As it is, the book is a thinly clad skeleton, with bones protruding where there should be blood and muscle. Still it is acceptable, because it is a sign of the resources behind it.

Bishop Coxe, in the excusable guise of an "Introduction," has written absolute history, embellishing it with rich comments, and so avoiding the partisan spirit as to commend the work to Christian students generally. Preferring Church history in the concrete, and eager to follow writers not of our guild who unravel the intricacies of religious development from the earliest times, we turned to this book with hope, and have not been disappointed.

Dissolving Views in the History of Judaism. By Rabbi SOLOMON SCHINDLER, of the Temple Adath Israel in Boston. 12mo, pp. 340. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Charles T. Dillingham. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

The learned rabbi holds that Judaism is an historical illustration of the law of evolution, in that it developed from a germ to its present state, and has assumed a new appearance upon every new stage of development. Disavowing the theory that religion was a concrete somewhat delivered

to the race at the beginning, he considers that form of it which, rising into view in Moses, progressed, changed, rose, and fell, affecting history and being affected by it, until it stands before the world circumscribed in influence and yet potent with an imperishable life—the Judaism of his people. The more than twenty epochs of change he describes are associated with some prominent figure in Jewish history who instrumented the epoch, or justified it after the turning-point had been passed. The book is, therefore, largely biographical of the leadership of Israel from the time of Moses, as well as historical in its scope and doctrinal in its teaching. He describes the American Israelite as a believer in God; a disbeliever in the theory of the literal restoration of the Jews to Palestine; an optimist; and that his religion is superior to Christianity, which he holds is pessimistic as to this life, and which for centuries contaminated the purer and loftier faith of his race. As a Jewish work, able, almost impartial, and certainly abundant in facts, it is cordially commended to the examination of the Christian.

The History of Nicolas Muss. An Episode of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Translated from the French of CHARLES DU BOIS-MELLY. Pp. 227. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Neither the Catholic nor the Protestant will enjoy this book; the former because it is a revelation of the iniquity of that eventful massacre, and the latter because it exhibits a hostility to his faith that still exists and is unpardonable. Still, both Catholic and Protestant should read it for the reason that neither will enjoy it. Awful history sometimes should be read and remembered. This book, however, is not a history of St. Bartholomew or its festival of blood, but an episode in the life of one of the adherents of the Protestant cause. Nicolas Muss, surrounded by comrades in Geneva, narrates how he was led to Paris in 1569, where he remained during the fierce trials of the Huguenots, adventuring his own life; how he was delivered, and how he protected a young damsel who afterward became his spouse. The narration takes historic colors at every turn, reflecting the tyrannical spirit of the Roman Church three hundred years ago in France, showing the bravery of the persecuted sects, who would not yield their faith, and depicting in aside ways the general effect of the persecution upon the country and the Church. The King of Navarre is on our right in this narrative, and the Huguenots on the left, with that unquenchable hatred of the Protestant heresy in the center. As it proceeds the reader is in doubt if Nicolas Muss, or that crystallized abomination of tyranny that would suppress innocent independence and courageous honesty in man, is the chief figure, or the core of the "episode."

Four Centuries of Silence; or, From Malachi to Christ. By Rev. R. A. REDFORD, M.A., LL.B., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics, New College, London: Author of *The Christian's Plea Against Modern Unbelief*, *Studies in the Book of Jonah*, etc. 12mo, pp. 258. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. Cloth, \$1.25.

The cessation of the prophetic period in the Jewish Church at the close of the time of Ezra, Haggai, and Malachi was followed by the long period of

four hundred years, whose dullness was broken by a Maccabean epoch, or by those quiet preparations for the Messianic day that was heralded by John from the wilderness, whose presence brought the temporary revival of the prophetic office. A study of this period of Jewish history, the author of this book justly believes, is essential to an apprehension of the unity of the old and new dispensations; and he has, therefore, attempted to set it forth with considerable fullness, and in language chaste and even elegant. Beginning with the great synagogue, of which the last prophets probably were members, he traces the rise of the Jewish pontificate, the great influence of the Septuagint, the position of the Apocrypha in Jewish literature, the origin of Jewish sects, the jurisdiction and constitutionality of the Jewish Sanhedrin, and the foreshadowing dawn of the day of the Son of man, characterizing the period rather than writing its history. He makes clear, also, that, in the absence of prophets or teachers, tradition rather than law, and forms rather than the true spirit of worship, exercised a directing control in the almost defunct Church of the Jews; hence, when Christ appeared tradition was in vogue and religious sects were numerous.

POETRY AND ART.

Richard Wagner's Poem, The Ring of the Nibelung. Explained and in part Translated by GEORGE THEODORE DIPPOLD, Ph.D. Author of *The Great Epics of Mediaeval Germany*, etc. 12mo, pp. 240. New York: Henry Holt & Co. Price, \$2.

Richard Wagner was a poet as well as musician. In this poem he rescues the original traditions concerning the Nibelungs, a race of supernatural beings that inhabited Nibelheim, and presents them in the form of four dramas, thus securing their preservation after most careful elimination of extraneous and associated stories that gathered about them in historic times. Of elfs and giants, of scenes and superstitions, of gods and goddesses, of mythologies and prehistoric memorials, there is an abundance; and Wagner, forgetting his revolutionary music, draws forth from this howling wilderness all that he finds of forces and beings, assigns them special parts or places, and fashions the poem in a genuine poetic spirit. Without the explanatory comments of the translator, the poem would be to the average American reader a sealed treasure, but he has opened it to public gaze, and its wealth of poetic beauty is as transparent as its conformity to the traditions is evident.

The Renaissance. Studies in Art and Poetry. By WALTER PATER, Fellow of Brasenose College. 12mo, pp. 252. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, cloth, \$2.

Eschewing an abstract definition of beauty, the author unites art and poetry as a proper subject of æsthetic criticism, because he finds in them the objective elements of the highest beauty. On this common basis are they congruous or related professions. Commencing with early French compositions, and concluding with an analysis of Winckelmann as a su-

perb artist and teacher of the eighteenth century, he confines his elaborate work to the poets and artists of the fifteenth century, the period of the Renaissance proper. While Michael Angelo and Leonardo da Vinci are the larger figures of that art-age, it is refreshing to read of Sandro Botticelli, Luca della Robbia, Joachim du Bellay, and the school of Giorgione, since they contributed to the development of the taste of the day, and gave direction to the aspiration of the artists and poets that followed them. The book rescues from national depreciation the names of worthy co-laborers in the realm of highest art, and so is valuable to the student of that historic period.

The Bhagavad Gītā; or, The Lord's Lay. With Commentary and Notes, as well as References to the Christian Scriptures. Translated from the Sanskrit for the Benefit of Those in Search of Spiritual Light. By MOHINI M. CHATTERJI, M.A. 8vo, pp. 283. Boston: Ticknor & Co.

It is admitted that the ethics and religious technics of the Vedas correspond to some extent with those of the Bible; but this correspondence rather establishes the priority of the Old Testament than that of Vedic literature. The Hindoo and not a few secular writers are still debating the significance of this correspondence. Christian scholarship centers itself not so much in this question of antecedence as in the actual agreement of the spiritual truths declared in the two scriptures. *The Bhagavad Gītā* is the oldest Vedaic, or most sacred book, of the Hindoos. It consists of seven hundred and seventy verses, chiefly devoted to a discussion of the being of God, and has been interpreted by three renowned commentators—Sankarāchārya, Rāmānujāchārya, and Madhvāchārya—who differ in regard to the relation between the Spirit of God and the real nature of the spirit of man. They, however, agree in teaching that God is the only reality; a most pernicious error in theology and philosophy, for it paves the way for the final disappearance of man as a conscious being. This, of course, is not in harmony with Christian doctrine. The learned translator of the Hindoo Bible conceives an exact parallelism between the spiritual doctrines taught therein and the revelations of the New Testament; and on that alleged discovery urges harmony between Christians and Hindoos in the moral reconstruction of his native land. His preface is a plea for mutual co-operation, and is the forerunner of another new day in India. As a piece of Sanskrit literature this volume excites curiosity. The style of composition is elliptical, ambiguous, adjectival, monotonous; the grammar is treacherous on every page; the philosophy is quite out of date; the science is absurd; and the theology is the product of dim-visioned authorship.

Lays of Ancient Rome. By THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, Litt.D., and JOHN C. ROLFE, Ph.D. With Engravings. 12mo, pp. 199. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, 56 cents.

Matthew Arnold declared against the poetry of Macaulay's "Lays," but Edmund Clarence Stedman and other seers detect in them the afflatus of a genuine poet. As, however, this little volume, one of the series of

"English Classics," is not issued as poetry, but as a companion-book in the study of Latin in high schools and academies, it serves its purpose, and the higher criticism against it is valueless. The "Notes" of the editors, father and son, are of more importance than the "Lays," as they explain the references to Roman laws and customs, without which the verse would be unintelligible.

Lamartine. Selected Poems from Premières et Nouvelles Méditations. Edited, with Biographical Sketch and Notes, by GEORGE O. CURME, A.M., Professor of German and French, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa. 16mo, pp. 179. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.

To readers of the French language this collection of Lamartine's poems will be welcomed as a *souvenir*. The biographical sketch of the poet, with critical notes of the text and the explanatory chapter on the general character of French verse, excite a studious interest in the meditations, and serve to introduce to the American scholar one of the most refined and purest of French writers. Professor Curme has performed his delicate task with critical acumen, and an appreciative sagacity of the beauties of the language as well as the rich treasures of the Christian poet.

FICTION.

The fiction-writer is always busy, because fiction readers are numerous and ever multiplying. Though Viscount Cranbrook, a member of the British Cabinet, may not read novels, Mr. Gladstone devours them, and occasionally reviews them in the magazines of the day. His commendation of *John Inglesant* endowed that ably written production with enduring fame and an immense sale. He has recently spoken his mind concerning *Robert Elanere*, from the pen of Mrs. Humphrey Ward, an Englishwoman of rare ability, who has produced a book, republished by Macmillan & Co., of New York, which has created more interest in high circles, both in England and America, than any novel of the period. The substratum of the work is a religious inquiry; proving that the popular mind at once takes to religious themes provided they are treated with brilliancy and delicacy. What the effect of this book will be upon the reader will depend upon his religious temperament and education. If he is intrenched in the Christian faith it may stimulate him to hold fast his integrity; if inclined to religious aberration it may strengthen his independence of religious restraint, and assist him in overcoming the exactions of a creed. On the whole, the book is as dangerous as it is fascinating, illustrating the dangers of agnosticism and the insidious poison of Unitarianism.

That rapid writer, Mrs. Amelia E. Barr, in *Remember the Alamo*, issued by Dodd, Mead & Co., of New York, exhibits an improved skill and a most graceful style, and she will be regarded with increased favor by those who have read her other volumes.

Victor Hugo does not excel himself in *Notre-Dame de Paris*, but every

page breathes his spirit, and the whole is a scintillation of French beauty, mystery, and life. The book is founded on a single Greek word—AN'APKH—he one day discovered in an obscure nook of one of the towers of the famous old Church of Notre-Dame. The translator—Isabel F. Hapgood—is an expert, and has revealed the beauty and transparency of the French and the opulence and majesty of the English language, while the publishers, Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., of New York, offer to the public a handsome specimen of book-making at a reasonable price.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Modern Cities and their Religious Problems. By SAMUEL LANE LOOMIS. With an Introduction by Rev. JOSIAH STRONG, D.D. 12mo, pp. 219. New York: The Baker & Taylor Company. Price, cloth, \$1.

The subject is of surpassing interest at the present time. In the delineation of the growth and social composition of cities—in the exposition of cities as sources of corruption, and, therefore, of danger to government—in the account of Christian work in London and Paris—and in his suggestions regarding the work to be done in our cities, the author summarizes a mass of facts both startling and expressive, and evinces on every page a heart-felt interest in the welfare of the country that should be shared alike by all the citizens thereof. Every lecture is an explosion whose sound should reach the ears of the nation, and the whole is a thunder-clap from every point of the horizon that should shake the people into activity for their own preservation from decay and death.

Days Serene. Illustrated from the Original Designs of Margaret MacDonald Pullman. Engraved on Wood and Printed under the direction of George T. Andrew. Boston: Lee & Shepard. Price, \$5.

The title is expressive of the contents. Each page contains a quotation from a poet suggestive of an exquisite wood-engraving that accompanies it, having reference to autumnal and winter days and scenes. In these respects it is most cheering; and, presented in the highest style of the book-maker's art, the large handsome quarto makes a fine impression and is exceptionally suited to the home during the days that are serene.

The Doctrine of Christian Baptism. An Exposition of Its Nature, Subjects, Mode, and Duty. By Rev. J. W. ETTER, D.D. 12mo, pp. 308. Dayton, Ohio: United Brethren Publishing House. Cloth, \$1 25.

A work on a thread bare subject, but many of the threads are new, strong, and unyielding to the strain of the exclusive immersionist. The chief value of the book is the discussion of the "mode of baptism" concerning which the author says the Scriptures are explicit in that they nowhere teach that there is only *one* mode of baptism. Modalism he does not find in the word "baptizo," or in any scriptural example of the ordinance of baptism, or in any precept or teaching of the sacred Scriptures. Dr. Etter has made his case, and his book should be circulated as an antidote to the sometimes contagious influence of the water-pest in the Churches.

Social Life and Literature Fifty Years Ago. 16mo, pp. 96. Boston: Cupples & Hurd. Price, cloth, \$1.

Not being in sympathy with any pessimistic view of life, we do not indorse the proposition of the anonymous author of these pages, that the literary writers of fifty years ago occupied a higher plane of thinking, displayed a more elegant style of composition, or were more affluent in literary skill and development than the writers of the present day. That age abounded in great men; this age in greater.

In Memoriam. A Record of the Funeral Services of Maria Louisa Phillips, wife of John M. Phillips of the Book Concern, who died September 9, 1888.

The principal address was by her pastor, the Rev. W. V. Kelley, D.D., followed by remarks from Dr. John Miley, of Drew Theological Seminary, and a closing prayer by a former pastor, Rev. W. L. Phillips. The addresses, discriminating, tender, and comforting; the prayers, full of resignation and faith; the Scripture lesson, read by Dr. S. Hunt, descriptive of the virtuous woman, and a basis for the speaker's thoughts; the song, soothing in spirit, and restful in its words—all these are fittingly reported in this beautiful memento, and must assuage the grief of the bereaved.

The Land Beyond the Forest. Facts, Figures, and Fancies from Transylvania. By E. GERARD. Author of "*Reata*," "*The Waters of Hercules*," "*Beggar My Neighbor*," etc. With Maps and Illustrations. 12mo, 403. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

We have here a woman's impression of Transylvania. Her husband being a cavalry officer in that country for two years, she enjoyed every opportunity for close and accurate observation of the scenery, the customs of the people, the military spirit, and the working of the governmental machinery in its varied adaptations, making her book reliable, interesting, and profitable to the general reader. We know of no volume that is equal to it for the information it conveys.

The Problem; or, The "Irrepressible Conflict" in Politics. By I. VILLARS, D.D., President of McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill. 16mo, pp. 237. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Paper cover, 25 cents.

A trenchant *résumé* of the evils of the liquor traffic, with a vigorous defense of the principle of prohibition, together with arguments for the Prohibition Party. Dr. Villars is doing excellent service by his brochure, but the new edition should contain revised statistics, if not more grip-like arguments.

Irish Wonders. The Ghosts, Giants, Pookas, Demons, Leprechauns, Banshees, Fairies, Witches, Widows, Old Maids, and Other Marvels of the Emerald Isle. Popular Tales as Told by the People. By D. R. MCANALLY, Jr. Illustrated by H. R. Heston. Small quarto, pp. 218. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$2.

An accumulation of folk stories, abounding in wit and humor, and illustrating a phase of Celtic literature quite worthy of preservation. The book is a cure for *ennui*.

